

THE
ECLECTIC REVIEW

FOR MAY, 1845.

- Art. 1. *The New Statute and Mr. Ward.* By the Rev. F. D. Maurice, Chaplain of Guy's Hospital, and Professor of English Literature, King's College, London.
2. *Thoughts on the Rule of Conscientious Subscription.* By ditto.
3. *The Proposed Degradation and Declaration.* By G. Moberly, D. C. L., Head Master of Winchester College.
4. *Heads of Consideration on the case of Mr. Ward.* By the Rev. J. Keble, late Fellow of Oriel College.
5. *Oxford: Tract 90: and Ward's Ideal of a Christian Church, a Practical Suggestion, &c.* By the Rev. W. S. Bricknell, M. A., of Worcester College, and one of the Oxford City Lecturers.
6. *Subject of Tract 90 Historically Examined.* By the Rev. F. Oakeley, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, Prebendary of Lichfield, and Minister of Margaret Chapel, St. Mary-le-bone.
7. *M.D.CCC.XLV, the Month of January, Oxford.* By W. Winstanley Hull, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister at Law, late Fellow of Brasenose College.
8. *A Letter to the Vice Chancellor of the University of Oxford, &c.* By A. C. Tait, D.C.L., Head Master of Rugby School, late Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College.
9. *Case of the Proposed Degradation and Declaration, on the Statute of Feb. 13.* Submitted to Sir J. Dodson, Knt., Queen's Advocate, and R. Bethell, Esq., Q. C.

10. *The University, the Church, and the New Test.* By the Rev. J. Garbett, Prebendary of Chichester, and Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford.
11. *An Address to Members of Convocation, in Protest against the proposed Statute.* By the Rev. W. G. Ward, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.
12. *The Oxford Chronicle.*

THE above are but a small selection from a host of pamphlets and other productions of the press, which, as soon as the intentions of the Hebdomadal Board, in the case of Mr. Ward, were announced, entered in rapid succession the arena of controversy. Every week witnessed the arrival of new literary forces; and as the meeting of convocation drew near, the intensity of the approaching strife became more strongly apparent. Oxford was evidently to be the scene and the centre of a most unusual excitement. Within the walls of those venerable structures which, in their silent majesty seem the very personification of contemplative calmness, how many a learned head was full of anxious thought, how many a heart was palpitating with anticipation and doubt as to the result of the thirteenth of February ensuing; while the tables of the common rooms were groaning beneath the weight of Appeals, Warnings, and Considerations, addressed to the members of convocation. Even the light-hearted under-graduates ventured an excursion now and then into the regions of thought, and exchanged their sentiments with others of their order with a seriousness quite unusual. The citizens, also, forgetting that hereditary awe which university Brahminism inspires, took an unwonted interest in the ecclesiastical struggle, and not only discussed pretty freely the merits of the controversy, but chose their side, and favoured, at least with their ardent wishes, one or other of the great belligerent parties. But the interest in the proceedings against Mr. Ward was not confined to 'the city of palaces;' the pulsations of this central heart were felt more or less throughout Europe; there was not, we imagine, a zealous supporter of the papacy, nor a thoughtful protestant, between the Ganges and the Isis, whom tidings of this case had reached, who felt uninterested in its issue.

But why should the proceedings of a literary and theological body towards one of its own members create so general a sensation? What had the community at large to do with the charge of broken faith, and the loss of academical honours? So, without doubt, thought many while they were pursuing their secularities, or working out their professional vocations, and so, as certainly, thought many a German, who casually

heard of the theological disputes between the ecclesiastical authorities, and the monk of Erfurth. Were the case to which we now refer of an isolated kind, were its consequences limited to Mr. Ward, it might pass by, as do university proceedings in general, without exciting interest or inviting comment. But it is only an outward symptom of morbid action throughout a vast system, one single indication of the approaching war of elements, the extent and the consequences of which no sagacity can foresee. Mr. Ward, has, like many a knight of the olden time of high and ardent chivalry, stepped forth from the ranks, and, reckless of danger, has thrown down his gauntlet in the face of a formidable array of hostile power; but he stands not alone; besides his shield-bearer Mr. Oakeley, there is a host, many of whom may blame his temerity, and would have preferred the counsels of the πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεὺς of Littlemore, who are nevertheless banded in the same cause, and prepared for the great conflict. It may, indeed, be regarded as an affair of advanced posts, but such partial collisions frequently are the prelude to a general engagement. We must therefore regard this demonstration, not merely as an affair personal to Mr. Ward; we must look at it not merely in this single point; to estimate its value, we must take a wider range, a more comprehensive view.

It was early in 1833 that a few Oxford divines, deeply imbued with the love of ecclesiastical antiquarianism, and seriously alarmed at the position of the English church and the aspect of the times, met to exchange their sympathies in mutual condolence, and, if possible, to concert measures to meet the present exigency. A tide of popular opinion, unfavourable to the high pretensions and the exclusive spirit of the Church of England, had set in. The Act of Catholic Emancipation had passed, which removed civil disabilities on the ground of religious opinion, from a large portion of British subjects. The Test and Corporation Acts had been repealed, and the way to civic honours was thus opened to dissenters. A liberal ministry was at the head of the government. Ten bishoprics had been taken from the overgrown hierarchy of the Irish church. The Reform Bill had been carried, and a parliament was now convened, in which the spirit of reform was more active than was desired, even by the ministry themselves. Ecclesiastical abuses were denounced. The utility of bishops in the house of peers was questioned. A revision of the liturgy was suggested. The admission of dissenters into the national universities even passed the House of Commons; and searching inquiries, with a view to further reforms both in church and state, were proposed. All these things were considered ominous by a considerable

portion of the clergy, and consternation at once alarmed and paralysed them. It was at this conjuncture that the Oxford agitation commenced, and the addresses circulated by a small, but spirited band of men, fell like a spark on combustible matter. 'One of the first results of this movement, was,' according to the statement of the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, 'the clerical address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, signed by, (I think,) about 7000 of the clergy; and another was, the lay declaration of attachment to the church, signed by upwards of 230,000 heads of families.' (A Collection of Papers, &c., pp. 11, 12.) One of the principal doctrines which it was agreed at a meeting at Oxford to put forward with prominence and zeal, was that of the 'Apostolic succession, as a rule of practice, which is thus laid down':—

'(1.) That the participation of the body and blood of Christ is essential to the maintenance of Christian life and hope in each individual.

'(2.) That it is conveyed to individual Christians *only* by the hands of the successors of the apostles and their delegates.

'(3.) That the successors of the apostles are those who are descended in a direct line from them by the imposition of hands; and that the delegates of these are the respective presbyters whom each has commissioned.' (Collection, &c., p. 12.)

This doctrine, which had been long regarded as a mere obsolete notion, was now circulated with assiduity, and inculcated with great earnestness; it was too flattering to episcopal dignity to be frowned on by the bishops, the clergy eagerly seized it as ministering to their importance; even the evangelical clergy to a considerable extent caught the bait, and among the laity of the high church party, it was thought no small boast that *they* belonged to a church, whose ministers were descended from the apostles, and whose sacraments were the only channels of grace.

In order to further these, and other 'church principles' of the new school, a new catechism, or an addition to the old one, was drawn up, and most widely circulated, under the title of '*The Churchman's Manual; or Questions and Answers on the Church, on Protestant and Romish Dissenters, and Socinians*;' in which, while exclusive privileges are claimed for the national clergy as the only authorized teachers of religion, and the dispensers of God's grace to men, the people are cautioned against those intruders, who, whatever may be their success, may be as great impostors as Mahomet, and whatever their apparent piety, may fear the doom of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. But the most effective means employed, in addition to oral commu-

nications, which all were expected earnestly to employ, was that series of publications called Tracts for the Times. These were produced in quick succession, and gradually unfolded a system but little short of popery itself. Tradition was placed side by side with the scriptures, the right of private judgment was denounced, ascetic practices were inculcated, the sacraments administered by the clergy were the only channels of God's grace; and one after another almost all the peculiarities of Romanism came out. Some blamed unguarded expressions, while numbers, especially of the younger clergy, and the undergraduates at the Universities, became increasingly ripened towards full blown Romanism. All obsolete customs connected with 'the good old times of ghostly ignorance' were sought after, and in good measure revived. Books of devotion were printed with red lines, letters were dated according to the saint's-day or the holy feast, crosses were had in great request, fasting according to the rules of Rome, and other penances for the soul's health became general; and onwards the movement went, and its motto might have been '*crescit eundo.*' Publications in favour of church principles and tractarian theology inundated the kingdom; the press was engaged in almost every way to aid its progress; reviews, periodicals of every kind, weekly and daily journals, sermons and novels, Keble's Christian Year, and Neale's ballads, all were employed in their respective vocations as auxiliary to this movement in the direction of Rome.

It was seen after some time, and that by church and university authorities, whither all this was tending; but as one of its patrons wrote to the Bishop of Oxford, it was gone too far for a mere check; the pulpits in almost every town of England were ringing with it—the colonies of Great Britain in every part of the globe were infected with it; every succeeding generation of undergraduates was exposed to its action, and yearly did the sons of our aristocracy leave their studies impregnated with this more than semi-Romanism, and some of them from time to time joined the church of Rome. Many of the bishops saw now that things were going in a direction which created some apprehension, but it was difficult to stop the current. The Bishop of Oxford had either not perception to discover, or courage to oppose, the tendencies of the new movement. Subject as he was to the constant influences of minds stronger than his own, and disliking evangelical religion himself, he had neither the will nor the power to prevent its progress. In his charge, in 1842, he spoke indeed of some who were proceeding injudiciously and rashly, but his commendations of the party were strong and hearty,

whilst his censure was of the mildest and the most inefficient kind. So strong were the adherents of the new theology in the university, that scarcely any had the power to withstand them, or the courage to rebuke them. A very large proportion of the tutors were also more or less imbued with the same Romish theology. In such circumstances it is scarcely to be wondered at, that the tractarian leaders became bolder and bolder, and approximated nearer and nearer towards Romish doctrine and Romish practice. It was openly declared that the church of England must be unprotestantized, and one who holds a fellowship at Magdalene College, since known by the name of cursing Palmer, in a pamphlet, published under the very eyes of the university, anathematized all things protestant at home and abroad, not excepting the church of England, if that must be considered protestant.

By this time many belonging to the university of Oxford became so saturated with Romanism, that they felt their position as members of the church of England very embarrassing; and especially did it appear perplexing to them how, with their Roman catholic belief, they could conscientiously sign the Thirty-nine Articles, or continue in the enjoyment of advantages and emoluments which were possessed on their presumed adherence to these Articles. To relieve the minds of such, and, as it was afterwards acknowledged by the author of Tract 90, to prevent their withdrawing from the church of England, and uniting themselves with a church the doctrines and practices of which they approved and admired, a way was ingeniously shewn how they might expound the Thirty-nine Articles, so as to make them perfectly compatible with the Tridentine decrees. This was the production of Mr. Newman, the master-spirit of the whole movement; the original expedient was that of the Jesuit Sancta Clara, but as wrought out and applied by Mr. Newman, it was perhaps as clever, as acute, and as dishonest a piece of casuistry as the world ever saw. Throughout the kingdom it produced, from all whose moral sensibilities had not been impaired by strong party feeling, one simultaneous burst of surprise and indignation.

Will nothing now be done to check the movement? Can no power be brought to bear on such dishonesty? Must this moral poison be allowed to taint the very fountains of literature and theology? Something is indeed done; but every attempted check proves feeble and ineffective. A war of pamphlets ensues, in which Mr. Ward first distinguishes himself as an avowed champion of tractarianism, ready to do battle in defence of Mr. Newman and his opinions. The bishop of the diocese and the authorities of the university are loudly called on to inter-

pose their influence; the former in a mild and gentle manner, more apparently for the sake of peace than from any strong disapprobation of the opinions advanced in the Tracts,* requests or advises his friend to discontinue them; on the part of the latter, the Hebdomadal Board, now for the first time lifting up its voice in this controversy, issues the following declaration.

After recounting the statutes requiring subscription, and referring to Tract 90,—

‘Resolved, that the modes of interpretation, such as are suggested in the said tract, evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling the subscription to them, with the adoption of errors, which they were designed to counteract, defeat the object, and are inconsistent with the due observance of the above-mentioned statutes.

Delegates’ Room, March 15, 1841.

P. WYNTER, Vice-chancellor.’

But the movement goes on, unobstructed by these proceedings. Dr. Hampden, the Regius Professor, almost the only man in the university who, from his station, his talents, and his learning, might have made head against it, was in a great measure crippled and paralyzed through the prejudice which the Newman and Pusey party had, with a zeal worthy of a better cause, and a disingenuousness disgraceful to any cause, succeeded in raising against him, and which issued in the cruel and unjust measures which were sanctioned by convocation. An attempt has since been made by the same authorities who introduced these measures to repair the mischief, but their well-meant efforts were unsuccessful, and the stigma was not removed. Still the Regius Professor was able to make a firm stand, in the case of Macmullen, and, after a long struggle, to succeed, in establishing his right to give theses to the candidate for the degree of B. D., by which the Romanist was compelled to bring out his sentiments on the Eucharist and tradition, and so lost his degree.

The condemnation of Dr. Pusey’s sermon on the Eucharist, by the six doctors appointed by the vice-chancellor, was rather a temporary mortification than any severe check to the tractarian movement. It still gathered strength and increased

* We understand that two sons and two nephews of the Bishop of Oxford, together with the bishop’s chaplain, who is an ultra tractarian, subsequently signed the address to the proctors, thanking them for interposing their veto to prevent the condemnation of Tract 90, in the convocation of the 13th of February. The Oxford Chronicle, which has been all along a close and shrewd observer of the movements of tractarianism, observes that, “Mr. Newman rules Dr. Pusey, Dr. Pusey rules Archdeacon Clarke, and he and the bishop’s chaplain rule the bishop.”

in activity. In various parts of the kingdom, alterations were made in the decorations and services of the churches, to assimilate both as nearly as possible to the Romish pattern. A vigorous attempt was also made to prevent the election of Dr. Symons to the vice-chancellorship of the university, in consequence of the part he had taken in the condemnation of Dr. Pusey's sermon, which, though unsuccessful, produced such an exhibition of strength and determination as might well render any future vice-chancellor, till they should obtain one of their own stamp, careful how he incurred their displeasure.

By this time, such had been the progress of the Romanizing system in the university of Oxford, that at least one half of the tutors were believed to be more or less under its influence. And in these circumstances it was that Mr. Ward's book on the 'Ideal of a Christian Church' was published, which occasioned the memorable struggle to which the works at the head of this article refer, and the full effects of which none can calculate. One object of Mr. Ward in thus writing was to vindicate the highly Romanizing articles of the British Critic from the animadversions of Mr. Palmer, himself one of the earliest and most active of the Oxford agitators; but its principal design seems to have been to bring the contested point of holding the doctrines of the Roman catholic church, while subscribing the articles of the English church, to an issue. Though the heads of houses had formally expressed an opinion condemning the mode of subscription advocated by Tract 90, their decision was set at nought by the tractarian party, and the venerable board itself was spoken of in no very measured terms of indignation and contempt. The question, it was declared, was still open. The holding of Romish doctrines had not been declared incompatible with subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles by any ecclesiastical or university authority, to which they were bound to defer. This work, then, was a fearless challenge, distinct and loud, sent ringing into the ears of the university, which was dared to take it up. The Reformation which made the church of England what it is, was branded with infamy, and treated with indignant scorn. The reformers in which the church had been accustomed to glory, and some of whom had as martyrs sealed their testimony against popish errors with their blood,* were represented as unprincipled innovators, the church itself was described as dishonoured, degraded, and deprived of the most valuable aids to devotion by separation from the church of Rome; and her return, with humble submission and dutiful obedience, was a consummation devoutly to be wished.

* Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer were burnt in Oxford, and just in the front of Mr. Ward's college.

This was, indeed, an adventurous step, the straight forward and manly bearing of which none could question, though of its prudence and policy a considerable portion of the tractarian host had serious doubts. But a bold stroke often succeeds, where the cunning of artifice fails. Deeds of high daring, rash and reckless as they may be deemed by more cautious spirits, frequently intimidate opposition, throw confusion into the ranks of the enemy, and inspire the more feeble of their own party with an enthusiasm to follow on where bravery leads. Such was the strength of Mr. Ward's party, their spirit and energy were so well known, so little discouragement had they received from high quarters, and such was the critical state of things in the church itself, that any decisive measures against this party would be apparently attended with so much danger as to render it highly probable that the university would decline any effective interference; and should this be the case, the great point would be gained, silence would be construed as consent, whether willingly or reluctantly given, the university might be filled by those who had embraced 'the whole cycle of Roman doctrine,' who might go on unmolested with their work of unprotestantizing, till either the church of England should become a kind of minor papacy, or be reconciled to the church of Rome, and again received into her maternal bosom, as a somewhat profligate, but at length, penitent daughter. But so startling and alarming was this daring movement of the coadjutor of Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey, that numerous and strong appeals were made to the vice-chancellor on the imminent danger which now threatened the protestant establishment, and the necessity of adopting some decisive measures to meet the present exigency. Accordingly the Hebdomadal Board met on the 13th of December, and announced their resolutions, which, as they have been copied in most of the journals, and our space is limited, we need not here repeat further than to say, that, after selecting several passages from his book, condemning in strong terms the English reformation, extolling the church of Rome, from which the church of England had sinfully departed, and to which it should return with deep repentance, declaring that the spirit and teaching of the Articles and the Prayer Book were 'absolutely contradictory,' that it is by divorcing the 'dry wording of the Articles from their natural spirit' that 'an orthodox believer' accepts them, and that thus 'their *primâ facie* meaning is evaded, and the artifice of their inventors thrown back in recoil on themselves; that though the 'XIIth Article is as plain as words can make it on the evangelical side, its natural meaning may be explained away,' and that he himself 'subscribes it in a non-natural sense,' rejoicing that he finds 'the

whole cycle of Roman doctrine gradually possessing numbers of English churchmen,' and declaring that he said plainly three years ago, that in subscribing the Articles he renounced no one Roman doctrine.' After producing these extracts, the propositions which were now to be submitted to the house of convocation, on the 13th of February, 1845, were stated; these were to condemn Mr. Ward's sentiments, to deprive him of his degree, and to procure in future a *bonâ fide* subscription.

Before we proceed, a few words on the constitution and government of the University of Oxford, as far as the proceedings against Mr. Ward are concerned, may not be superfluous. This university comprises nineteen colleges and five halls, each of which, with its principal, master, warden, or provost, its vice-principal, &c., and its fellows, tutors, and other officers, has its separate jurisdiction. Everyone who enters any college or hall, has, at his matriculation, to sign the Thirty-Nine Articles. On taking a degree, he has again to subscribe these articles, and also the three articles mentioned in the thirty-sixth canon of 1603, in the presence of the proctors. The chief officer of the university is the chancellor, who, with considerable powers, is chosen for life. The vice-chancellor, however, who is head of one of the colleges, performs the principal duties of the office, and though annually elected, generally retains office for four years. The laws by which the university is governed, are a body of statutes, which the convocation may, to a certain extent, alter or amend from time to time. A weekly council is held, called the Hebdomadal Board, consisting of the vice-chancellor, the heads of houses, and the two proctors, who are annually chosen from the colleges and halls in rotation. This board alone has the initiative power in all proceedings in convocation, which is composed of the heads of colleges and halls, or their deputies; the doctors in divinity, medicine, and civil law; professors, and lecturers, with certain limitations; and masters of arts whose names have been kept on the books of some college or hall: these, when assembled together, form the House of Convocation, under the presidency of the chancellor, or his deputy, the vice-chancellor. The proceedings, except by special permission, are all in Latin. A majority of the house, or the chancellor or vice-chancellor alone, or the proctors alone, may negative any proposed decree; but no party in convocation has power to originate a measure, or to propose an alteration or amendment.

As the university authorities deeded it incumbent on them to meet the case, they proposed to deal with it in the only way which appeared fairly open to them, and to treat Mr. Ward not as a theological, but a moral delinquent. They charged him,

therefore, as one of their body, with a breach of faith, with holding his station in the university by subscribing articles which he did not believe, and openly maintaining errors which they are most evidently intended to condemn. No sooner are these resolutions of the Hebdomadal Board made public, than a storm of pamphlets rages. Week after week, and almost day after day, some new messenger of the press claims a hearing from the vice-chancellor or the members of convocation; some come forward to justify the members of the board, and to cheer them onwards in their work; but by far the greater number dissuade, threaten, denounce, and prophecy all manner of evils to church and state, if the proposed measures should be carried. There were, as we have seen, three distinct propositions to be submitted to convocation; the first, that a declaration should be made, on evidence furnished by Mr. Ward's book, that he had broken faith with the university; the second, that he should be deprived of those degrees, which it was considered he had forfeited by his violated engagement; and the third was, that the statute respecting subscription should be so amended as to give additional security for a fair and honest subscription, by rendering prevarication almost impracticable. All these measures were attacked by some, the second and third by many more, and the third by not a few who approved of the others. Among the combatants of this field were, Mr. Oakeley, determined, if possible, to save his friend or to share his danger, who endeavoured to prove historically the hypocrisy of the compilers of the Articles, by shewing that, however apparently they condemned the tenets and practices of Rome, it was intended that papists, by signing them should gain access to the church, with its honours and emoluments;—Mr. Keble, who protests against the proceedings as being 'unfair and cruel in themselves,' and 'likely to be ruinous under our present circumstances';—Dr. Moberley, head master of Winchester college, who ridicules the Hebdomadal Board as a set of noodles, incapable of writing with either sense or grammar, but in their own bungling manner determining to do what is neither legal, nor just, nor wise;—the Rev. F. D. Maurice, professor of literature in King's College, London, who, though condemning Mr. Ward's opinions and practice, deprecates his trial before a tribunal comprising 'a miscellaneous mob of gentlemen from London clubs and country parsonages';—and Mr. Winstanly Hull, barrister of Lincoln's Inn, who while admitting that 'Mr. Ward has broken faith with the university, and what is of far more consequence, broken also his ordination vow,' condemns the proposed measures, and would have the case carried before some ecclesiastical tribunal, and treated theologically. These are some of the principal, though

but a few of those who took part against the proceedings of the Hebdomadal Board. On the other hand, Mr. Garbett, professor of poetry in the university, advocates at some length, and with considerable warmth and power, the whole of the measures ;— Mr. Bricknell, one of the Oxford city lecturers, strongly urges the board to go forward ; and Dr. Tait, head master of Rugby school, in a very lucid manner, supports the first and second propositions, but dissuades from the third. In addition to these, a case, drawn up by the friends of Mr. Ward, with much ingenuity, and submitted to Sir J. Dodson, Queen's advocate, and R. Bethell, Esq., Q. C., together with the opinion of these gentlemen, is published, who decide that 'The House of Convocation has not the power of depriving Mr. Ward of his degrees in the manner or on the grounds proposed ;' that 'the court of Queen's Bench would, by mandamus, compel the university to restore Mr. Ward to his degrees ;' and that the 'new sense' which is to be annexed to subscription, 'is contrary to law, which requires the clerical subscribers to take the Articles in their literal and grammatical sense.' But other counsel having been consulted on the part of the university authorities, an opposite opinion is obtained, which decides that 'the university has the power to degrade,' in such circumstances ; and that 'the extracts set forth in the notice contain sufficient cause to justify the House of Convocation, as representing the university, in coming to a decision on the subject, with a view to the degradation of Mr. Ward.' This opinion had the sanction of Sir F. Thessiger, solicitor-general, Sir C. Wetherall, Messrs. J. Addams, and J. Cowling.

As to the points of law which have been raised respecting the competency of the tribunal appointed to decide on Mr. Ward's case, we confess we feel but very little interest ; but as lookers on, we are in a favourable position to form an opinion on the moral part of the question. The most direct and natural mode of treating such a case, would seem to be by an ecclesiastical proceeding ; Mr. Ward, being by his own confession a Roman catholic in principle, while enjoying the emoluments of a protestant establishment, and sustaining the office of minister in a protestant church, should, in all fairness and honesty, be compelled to relinquish those emoluments, and to resign that office, to say nothing of the inconsistency of his remaining a member of a community, to the founders of which, and to their principles, he professes a 'burning hatred.' But unhappily, in the church of which Mr. Ward is a member, secular and spiritual concerns are so mixed up and confounded together, that we know of no mode of proceeding which could have been adopted by any ecclesiastical authority, of which, as conscientious be-

lievers in the New Testament, we could have approved. It would have been more accordant with our sense of justice, and with the views we entertain of the qualifications which literary degrees should designate, had Mr. Ward been deprived of his fellowship, and his ministerial office, and allowed to go over to the church of his devout affection and admiration, with 'all his blushing honours thick upon him.' But the Hebdomadal Board were not at liberty to follow out their own notions of equity; they were, to a certain extent, bound by statutes; the university had been openly challenged to take up the case, or to allow judgment to go by default in favour of signing protestant articles in a popish sense; and, observes Dr. Tait, 'as the bishops of our church seemed unwilling to move in the case, the thanks of the community are due to the heads of houses in Oxford, for taking upon themselves the odium and trouble of this most painful conflict.' (Letters to the Vice-chancellor, p. 9.)

The points at issue between the university authorities and Mr. Ward, and on which the House of Convocation had to decide, were these: they aver that he has broken faith with the university, by abjuring the very doctrines, the declared belief of which was a necessary condition of his obtaining and enjoying certain academical advantages; and that therefore the representatives of the university ought to deprive him of these advantages. Mr. Ward's advocates deny the charge advanced, and denounce the punishment proposed. As to the kind of punishment, we have already stated our doubts whether it is of the most appropriate character; but considering the nature of the delinquency, we cannot pronounce it severe. The conduct of Mr. Ward and his associates appears to us to exhibit insincerity so gross and palpable, to be such a sacrifice of truth and honesty to expediency, that every upright mind not bewitched and fascinated by 'the mother of abominations,' must regard it with the deepest reprobation.

And what is it which the advocates of this tortuous policy, this jesuitical craft, this double-faced theology, plead in defence of such conduct? It is curious to know by what process these tractarian Rosicrucians propose to convert falsehood into truth, deceit into sincerity, and earthly cunning into heavenly wisdom. The following are some of the manipulations which become apparent; whether there may not be others hidden from the observation of the uninitiated in the dark recesses of mental reservation, it is not for us to say. 1. The 'natural spirit,' of an article, unfavourable to Roman catholicism, is separated from its 'dry wording,' so that the real meaning of the words, by a kind of dissolving view, strangely disappears, and something essentially different rises on the same canvass. Every proposition which is difficult to be managed, like the ob-

ject in the pantomime touched by the wand of harlequin, undergoes a complete and sudden transformation, to the surprise of all beholders, and thus, *mirabile dictu*, affirmations deny, censures commend, and prohibitions the most absolute give unbounded license. This wonderful art, almost sunk into desuetude, was, after the lapse of ages, revived by the far-famed monk of Littlemore, and by him taught to his disciples, and to none with more success than to the author of the Ideal of a Church. And thus adroitly does the fellow of Balliol apply it; the articles 'breathe an uniform intelligible spirit;' yet, unhappily this spirit is not different merely from an 'orthodox,' that is a Roman catholic spirit, but is 'absolutely contradictory' to it. By the admirable dexterity of the operator, however, the offensive spirit is evaporated, the '*prima facie* meaning is evaded, and all the protestantism having been extracted out of the dry words, such a spirit is infused into them that the pope himself need not hesitate to sign them.

2. By a process very similar, the difficulty connected with 'the natural meaning' of an article may be easily removed. Instead of the 'natural,' that is the true and proper 'sense,' a 'non-natural,' that is, a forced and false 'sense' may be put on it. The article is still signed '*in a sense*,' it matters not however contrary to nature and reason. For instance, 'the twelfth article,' as Mr. Ward acknowledges, is 'as plain as words can make it, on the evangelical side,' but, by his dexterity, away goes all 'its natural meaning,' '*explained away*,' and it is signed in a 'non-natural' sense; that is, in a sense exactly opposite to its meaning; Mr. Ward's conscience is satisfied, and 'Brutus is an honourable man.'

3. The reformers, and the compilers of the Articles, it is said, were willing to include within the pale of the reformed church as many as could conscientiously sign these documents, though differing with themselves in some minor points. This is a piece of logical apparatus of great potency and convenience. It is no sooner applied, than forth comes this inference; these sagacious framers and compilers of articles, so anxious for uniformity, meant the very opposite of what their articles affirmed, or at least with a cunning, worthy of the Delphic responses, so contrived the wording of them that they might equally mean either of two things which are 'absolutely contradictory.' But alas, for the ingratitude of human nature; Mr. Ward cannot forget his 'burning hatred' to the Reformation, and all which pertains to it; instead, therefore, of being thankful, he turns on these men, some of whom, with all this supposed laxity of principle, were unaccountably willing to die for their opinions, and with a sardonic grin tells them how completely their own duplicity has 'recoiled on themselves.'

4. Another expedient to which these gentlemen have recourse, is the difference between 'holding' doctrines and 'teaching' them. The Articles may be subscribed, while Roman doctrines are held in all their extent, providing the liberty of 'teaching' them is not assumed. Then of course such publications as those with which the kingdom has been deluged, from the pens of Dr. Pusey, Messrs. Newman, Keble, Oakeley, Ward, and Palmer of Magdalen, pregnant as they are with Romanism of every kind, inculcated in the most zealous and plausible manner, must not be called 'teaching;' the active diffusion of anti-protestant opinions, by professors, by college tutors, by oral communication in daily intercourse, and by extensive epistolary correspondence, will not come under the charge of 'teaching.' It is taken for granted also that a minister's faith, has no necessary connection with his public labours, that it will not influence his preaching, that his head and heart may be completely saturated with Roman doctrines, without any of them ever oozing out, that a man of zeal and warmth shall constantly keep in abeyance those very doctrines which he deems the life of his spirit, and longs above all things to see prevalent in the church. It is assumed, moreover, that it is perfectly consistent with ministerial responsibility, to withhold part of what is believed to be 'the whole counsel of God,' to keep back 'that which is profitable,' and from considerations of expediency, to allow the people, so far as public teaching is concerned, to remain in ignorance of saving truth, and to 'perish for lack of knowledge!'

We confess that to read such statements, to repeat such enormous fallacies, puts our patience to no ordinary test, that we feel towards these various apologies for dishonesty, an indignation which it is difficult to repress. A man of common integrity must we conceive be strangely destitute of feeling, who can see unmoved the majesty of truth thus insulted, the interests of morality thus betrayed, and deceit and guile so openly, and so unblushingly avowed. Amidst so much wordy discussion about the latitude of interpretation which the Thirty-nine Articles admit, and the constant repetition of their compatibility with 'the whole cycle of Roman doctrine,' the mind is in danger of being misled, and of losing sight in some measure of the utter repugnance of these two opposites; it may be of advantage, therefore, to see them in juxtaposition. We hope that such an exhibition of them in a few particulars may not be considered misplaced.

'We find, Oh most joyful, most wonderful, most unexpected sight ; we find the whole cycle of Roman doctrine gradually possessing numbers of English churchmen.'—*The Ideal, &c.*, p. 565.

'Three years have passed since I said plainly, that in subscribing the Articles, I renounced no one Roman doctrine.'—*Ibid*, p. 567.

WHAT IS SUBSCRIBED.

ART. X. *Of Free Will.*—'The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God.'

ART. XI. *Of the Justification of Man.*—'We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works and deservings.'

'Wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.'*

ART. XII. Declares :—'That good works are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith.'

ART. XIII. *Of Works before Justification.*—'Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God : we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.'

ART. XXII. 'The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping, and Adoration, as well of Images as of Reliques, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.'

ART. XXV. 'There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of our Lord. Those five

WHAT IS BELIEVED.

Council of Trent : On Justification.

CANON V. 'Whosoever shall affirm that the Free Will of man has been lost and extinct by the fall of Adam : let him be accursed.'

CAN. XI. *On Justification.*—'Whoever shall affirm that men are justified solely by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ : let him be accursed.'

CAN. IX. *On Justification.*—'Whoever shall affirm that the ungodly is justified by faith only : let him be accursed.'

CHAP. VII. *On Justification :* Declares, that inherent righteousness is 'the sole formal cause of justification.'

CAN. XI. States, that inherent 'grace and charity' form part of the cause of justification. And CAN. XXXII. speaks of a man as 'being justified by his good works, which are wrought by him through the grace of God and the merits of Jesus Christ.'

CAN. VII. 'Whoever shall affirm that all works done before justification, in whatever way performed, are actually sins, and deserve God's hatred : let him be accursed.'

SESSION XXV. The Council declared : 'That there is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained there are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful, but especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the Mass.' All 'who have the care and charge of teaching' are 'to instruct the faithful concerning the Invocation and Intercession of the Saints, the honour due to Relics, and the lawful use of Images.' And the Council pronounces the sentence of condemnation on those 'who affirm that veneration and honour are not due to the relics of the saints ; and that the memorials of the saints are in vain frequented to obtain their help and assistance.'

SESSION VII. CANON 1. 'Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more

* Accordingly, Mr. Ward calls the doctrine of justification by faith only, 'a hateful heresy,' p. 44, note ; 'a hateful and fearful type of antichrist of prodigious demerits,' p. 305.

commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, &c., are not to be counted for Sacraments of the gospel. The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them.'

ART. XXXIII. 'Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of our Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance received, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.'

ART. XXXI. *Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.*—'The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifice of masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous conceits.'

or fewer than seven, viz., &c.; or that any of these is not truly and properly a sacrament: let him be accursed.' SESSION XIII. CAN. 6. 'Whoever shall affirm that the Eucharist is not to be honoured with extraordinary festive celebration, nor solemnly carried about in processions: let him be accursed.'

SESS. XIII. CAN. 2. 'Whoever shall deny the wonderful and peculiar conversion of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and of the whole substance of the wine into his blood; which conversion the catholic church most fitly terms Transubstantiation: let him be accursed.'

CAN. VIII. 'Whoever shall affirm that Christ, as exhibited in the Eucharist, is eaten in a spiritual manner only: let him be accursed.'

CAN. VII. 'Whoever shall affirm that it is not lawful to preserve the holy Eucharist: let him be accursed.'

CAN. VI. 'Whoever shall affirm that the Eucharist is not to be publicly presented to the people for their adoration: let him be accursed.'

SESS. XXI. CAN. 1. 'Whoever shall affirm that a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God in the Mass: let him be accursed.'

CAN. III. 'Whoever shall affirm that the sacrifice of the Mass ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfaction, and other necessities: let him be accursed.'

Now with such an exposition before us, does it require intellectual acuteness, or literary training to determine whether an honest subscription to the one is compatible with a conscientious belief of the other? We confidently ask, whether it is possible for any man of common sense and ordinary integrity to compare the two theological systems, as thus embodied in their accredited forms, and not to perceive that they are most decidedly and irreconcilably antagonistic. Apart from all enquiry as to the amount of truth or error which each contains, every unsophisticated mind, whether protestant or catholic, christian or heathen, must at once see that each condemns the other, that if one be true the other must be false; that in fact the Articles are a strong, plain, unequivocal protest against the decrees and canons, and that no man can possibly hold them both, any more than he can serve God and mammon; or believe that to be truth,

which he knows to be falsehood. To 'evade the meaning,' to 'explain it away,' and to place an unnatural sense upon the words, is to seek shelter from difficulty in a 'refuge of lies,' and to secure certain advantages by the sacrifice of truth and honesty. To what purpose is it that Dr. Moberly assures us that he knows Mr. Ward to be a man of the most thorough and upright integrity, that he is distinguished by 'the most noble elevation of moral conscientiousness,' while we have the fact before us, that by practising evasion he signs articles which he does not believe, and that he proclaims it, and glories in it. Is not this a mode of proceeding which, in the concerns of ordinary life, would be branded with infamy, and would destroy a man's commercial credit for ever? Mr. Keble solemnly warns the members of convocation against daring to affirm the 'bad faith' of his Romanizing friend, if any think it 'but possible' that the passage cited from his book, 'may be attributed to obliquity of judgment,' or 'incautious reasoning.' But if by some mental obliquity, men can persuade themselves that it is right to practice deceit, are they therefore exonerated from the charge of bad faith? Was Saul of Tarsus the less a persecutor, because, when he 'breathed out threatenings and slaughter' against the followers of Christ, he 'verily thought he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth?' When men do wrong against their convictions, there is some hope that they may pause in their career, or be checked in their course; but when by some unhappy process both reason and conscience are made parties to delinquency, there are none of whose return to virtue so little hope is to be entertained, and against whom it is so necessary to be on our guard.

Let it not, however, be supposed that we are doing injustice to Mr. Ward, or that we take too depreciating a view of his character. We are perfectly willing to believe that, up to a certain point, he is an upright and honourable man. But the more we admire his general excellencies, the more deeply are we grieved for this lamentable exception. This is the point on his mental retina where there is no power of distinct vision, this is the monomania of his morality; and how pernicious must be that school of theology which produces such an aberration of reason, such a paralysis of the moral sense in the case of subscription, is obvious to every one who is not under the Romanizing delusion. Who can calculate the amount of mischief to the interests of morality already occasioned in and out of the university by the dissemination of the principles of Tract No. 90; and what would be the condition of society, if these were allowed to imbue the minds of one generation of students after another, and so to spread their poison through all ranks of the commu-

nity, that the same principles of interpretation should be applied to wills, deeds, and written contracts in general? Still it is a comfort to know, that, unless in those cases in which a long process of fallacious ingenuity has been employed on minds already inclined towards popery, the common sense and common honesty of the nation will reject with abhorrence such detestable duplicity.

We have noticed, before referring to the proceedings of convocation, the principal arguments employed in this case, with the exception of Mr. Ward's own defence, to which we shall presently advert, as these publications before the trial constituted in fact the only discussion of the question. The House of Convocation admits of no new proposition, no amendment, no altering of a resolution proposed; every one must, therefore, come prepared to decide on the case from a previous consideration of its merits.

As the time of convocation drew near, the abandonment of the third proposition by the Hebdomadal Board was announced. A strong opinion, it was ascertained, prevailed against its adoption among men of almost all parties; the liberal were averse to more stringent measures, and therefore objected to a new test. Mr. Ward's friends denounced it as an act of usurpation and tyranny; while many judged that no declaration could bind men who could apply such principles of interpretation, as the tractarians had adopted. Indeed Mr. Oakeley subsequently declared, that he should find no difficulty in signing the proposed test. The proposition was withdrawn by the board. A requisition numerously signed, was subsequently presented to the authorities, requesting that measures might be taken, 'for submitting to the convocation about to assemble on the 13th of February next, a resolution conveying the formal censure of the university upon the principles inculcated in the 90th number of the 'Tracts for the Times,' and a solemn repudiation of the modes of interpreting the Thirty-nine Articles therein suggested.' In consequence, it was announced, by a resolution of the Hebdomadal Board, signed February 4, 1835, that, as in Tract 90, 'entitled, 'Remarks on certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles,' modes of interpretation were suggested, and have since been advocated in other publications purporting to be written by members of the university, by which, subscription to the said Articles might be reconciled with the adoption of Roman Catholic errors,' the following decree would be proposed to the House of Convocation, 'That modes of interpretation, such as are suggested in the said Tract, evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors, which

they were designed to counteract, defeat the object, and are inconsistent with the due observance of the above-mentioned statutes,' (mentioned in the preamble).

On the publication of this resolution, the battle of words was renewed again with fresh vigour; one publication followed another in rapid succession, and preparations were made on both sides for a desperate struggle. Men of high station, it is said, endeavoured in vain to prevail with the authorities to withdraw this last proposition; and when they failed, recourse was had to the proctors, both of tractarian principles, and one of whom so far gone in their mysteries that his college testimonials had been refused. Rumours were afloat respecting the intention of the proctors to take on themselves the heavy responsibility of placing their veto on the proceedings of convocation in relation to this last proposition; but it was scarcely believed that two men, of comparatively inferior standing in the university, would have the temerity of availing themselves of the power of their short lived office, to prevent the judgment of the university from being taken on a most important question. But it was soon known that, on Monday evening, scarcely three days preceding the convocation, the proctors had actually informed the Vice Chancellor that such was their intention.

At length the memorable 13th of February arrived, special trains by the Great Western, to and from Oxford, had been announced, and all was anticipation. Intense was the cold, and fast fell the snow; but the number of non-resident members who kept pouring in, and who were seen, despite of the inclemency of the weather, moving about in various directions, with earnestness depicted on their countenances, indicated that something of deep and unusual interest was about to happen. And seldom, if ever, had business of a university kind taken so deep a hold on the minds of the citizens. All seemed to feel, that events were pending, intimately connected with their civil and religious liberties, and anxious was the expectation as to the result. At twelve o'clock a congregation was held, in order that those Masters of Arts who had not yet taken their regencies, might be qualified according to statute for voting in the convocation. In the mean time, the great body of members had begun to assemble in the theatre, and to take their appropriate places. Measures had been adopted to prevent strangers and undergraduates from entering the quadrangle contiguous to the theatre. About one o'clock, the Vice Chancellor, the Heads of Houses, the Doctors, and the Proctors, in solemn procession approach, and enter the theatre. On the north side of this elegant and ample structure, is a raised platform or gallery, sloping forwards about eight or ten feet from the ground, in the centre the Vice Chancellor takes his place as president, on either

side of him is a chair, one for the high steward, another for the Regius professor of Divinity; and farther in front, and somewhat lower, sit the two proctors. The whole of this gallery or platform occupying the segment of a circle, is appropriated to the Doctors. Projecting somewhat from either side, and still further in front of the Doctors, appears a rostrum or pulpit. The whole area, the ladies gallery, and part of the undergraduates gallery, are now occupied by the Masters, all in university costume. As non-resident members, there are seen now in convocation, the Bishops of Chichester and Llandaff, the Earl of Eldon, Viscount Sandon, Lord Ashley, Lord Romney, Lord Haverdale, Sir J. Mordaunt, Sir T. D. Acland, Sir W. Heathcote, Sir R. Comyn, Sir S. Glynn, Mr. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., Mr. Henley, M.P., Mr. Mackinnon, M.P., Archdeacon Manning, Dr. Tait, Dr. Phillimore, Dr. Mereweather, Dr. Moberley, Dr. Russell, &c. Silence is obtained, all is breathless attention. All eyes are turned in succession from the Vice Chancellor and the other authorities, to the rostrum on the eastern side, where Mr. Ward is seen, accompanied by Mr. Oakeley, and other friends. The proceedings commence. The Vice Chancellor, speaking in Latin, states the object of the convocation, and directs the Registrar of the University, Dr. Bliss, to read these passages from Mr. Ward's, 'Ideal of a Christian Church considered,' which had previously been announced as the ground of the proceedings by the Hebdomadal Board. One or two members attempt to address the House, but are prevented, as not being in order at this stage of the proceedings. At Mr. Ward's request, to be allowed to speak in his vernacular tongue, the statute is, *pro tempore*, dispensed with, which requires the use of Latin only. Mr. Ward then enters on his defence with considerable address, in a speech which, with two pauses of a few minutes to recover his exhaustion, occupied from an hour to an hour and a half in the delivery, following pretty nearly the same line of argument as that he had pursued in his pamphlet previously published. He was heard with the deepest attention throughout. He first protested in a strong, but respectful manner, against the competency of the tribunal, and the legality of the proceedings; he then endeavoured to impress on the minds of members the great difficulty, and yet the necessity of deciding on his case with impartiality. As the defence has been published in so many forms, it is unnecessary here to enter into it at length; it may suffice to observe, that the drift of the whole argument was this: no man can subscribe all the formulas of the church in a natural sense; others, liberals, high churchmen, and evangelicals, have all been obliged to put a force on some parts of the Articles or Prayer-Book, though they differ as to the particular wording which they find it necessary to evade; it would be

unjust therefore to condemn him for what others have done, and are still doing, with impunity. During the delivery of his speech, expressions of approbation frequently burst forth, which were uniformly checked by Mr. Ward, who entreated the members of convocation to act with the calm deliberation of judges, and the seriousness of Christians. A protest in Latin is tendered by Mr. Ward. After two or three short addresses in Latin from some of the members, the Vice-Chancellor puts the question respecting the condemnation of the extracts from Mr. Ward's book, and immediately the walls of the theatre resound with the loud vociferation of 'placet,' of 'non placet,' mingling in confused hubbub. A scrutiny is demanded. The proctors take their station at the eastern and western doors to receive the votes as the members pass out, who return by the great door in front of the Vice-Chancellor. The senior proctor rises, and all is expectation. The case is decided; 'majori parti placet,' disposes of the first proposition. The numbers appear to have been—

For the Condemnation	-	-	777
Against it	-	-	386

Majority 391

The second proposition was then announced, respecting Mr. Ward's degradation. Mr. Ward alleges in his defence his willingness to serve the Church of England, if allowed, and therefore declares it harsh and severe, if while others who have joined the church of Rome are allowed to retain their degrees, he should be deprived of them. The question is again put. Mr. Ellison of Balliol College addresses the convocation in Latin. Votes are taken by the proctors, and again the placets have it, though with a much smaller majority. The numbers now are—

For the Degradation	-	-	569
Against it	-	-	511

58

Before the last question was decided, Mr. Ward left the theatre, and in Broad Street was loudly cheered by a large body of undergraduates.

The third proposition, for condemning the principles of interpretation advocated in Tract 90, was then put; on which the senior proctor rose, and at once stopped the proceedings of the whole convocation by pronouncing authoritatively, 'Nobis procuratoribus non placet.' This was succeeded by loud demonstrations of approbation and dissatisfaction, testified by cheers

and hisses ; and here the proceedings of the convocation terminated. Besides the protest, however, which Mr. Ward presented in due form, in a letter to the Vice-Chancellor, dated the 13th of Feb., he states his reasons why he holds that his 'position in the university is morally unaffected by what had passed,' which are briefly these. The convocation, or the university in any of its functions, is incompetent to determine authoritatively the sense in which the Articles are to be subscribed by its members. Legal authorities have determined that the university is not the 'imponens' in the matter of subscription, 'that the articles are imposed, and the sense of subscription determined by the law of the land; and that the judges of the ecclesiastical courts alone have the power authoritatively to declare that sense, while the supreme legislature alone has the power of altering or adding to it.' If, in Mr. Ward's view, convocation were the true 'imponens,' he would, without feeling 'disposed to inquire how far subscription is necessarily to be considered a continuing act,' at once relinquish his position in the university ; but, concluding his letter, he says, 'I cannot feel that any obligation is laid upon me, in consequence of the events of this day, to act for the future upon any different view of subscription to the Articles, from that on which I have hitherto acted, and which is expressed in my work and pamphlet.' Mr. Oakeley, also, without delay, writes to the Vice-Chancellor, calls his attention to a declaration which he has made in his pamphlet on Tract 90, and which he had repeated in a tract published during the previous fortnight, in these words, 'I have no wish to remain a member of the University, or a minister of the Church of England, under false colours. I claim the right which has already been asserted in another quarter, of *holding* (as distinct from teaching) *all Roman doctrine*, and that notwithstanding my subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles.' 'These words,' Mr. Oakeley says, 'with the same deliberation and distinctness, I again appropriate and repeat.' With, what appears to us, a disingenuous quibbling, capable of frittering away the sense and meaning of any declaration or act, he declares that he does not view the decree of convocation as touching his case as to his mode of subscribing the Articles. But disdaining any shelter to himself on this account, he challenges the university to deal with him as it had with Mr. Ward. But 'if, on the other hand,' he continues, 'I am allowed, after this plain and public declaration of my sentiments, to retain my place in the university, I shall regard such acquiescence as equivalent to an admission on the part of the academical authorities, that my own subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles is not at variance with 'good faith.' Before the non-resident members of convoca-

tion were dispersed, an address of thanks to the proctors was pretty numerously signed; among the signatures to which, were those of Mr. Gladstone, Judge Coleridge, Dr. Hook, Archdeacon Manning, and Sir W. Heathcote. A requisition to the Vice-Chancellor also received many signatures, requesting him that, as the university had, by the intervention of the proctors, been prevented from expressing an opinion on Tract 90, the matter might 'again, after the least possible delay, be submitted to convocation.'

There are some points in Mr. Ward's defence, which, on account of the light they throw on the present state of principles and parties, require a few remarks; his defence, we mean, as contained not only in his oral vindication on the memorable 13th of February, but especially as it is exhibited in a more consecutive and logical manner in his 'Address to Members of Convocation,' published some time previously. And in the outset we wish to do full justice both to the talents which it displays, and the spirit which it breathes. Mr. Ward, though he has his weak points, is assuredly not an opponent to be despised; he has much logical acumen, united with great warmth of manner and force of expression; he has both courage and address, and generally manages to convert a defence into a vigorous attack. There also appears an openness which is above suspicion, and a remarkable sincerity, even in the evasion and duplicity which he practises and acknowledges. There is also manifested a far greater disposition than might have been expected, to tolerate the opinions of others, and to remain on terms of peace with all in the church, however opposite may be their views. But what this spirit, wherever it now exists, might become, if once the Romanizing party ruled the university, is matter of some apprehension. Popery full and rank becomes apparently lamb-like when its talons are cut, its fangs extracted, and its movements restricted by a chain; but with liberty and power to work out its will, it is ever to be feared. The violence and malignity with which the yet masked tractarians assailed Dr. Hampden, and the persevering agitation *per fas et nefas* by which they succeeded in raising a storm of persecution against him—much to the present regret of many who took part in it—together with the general character of their more recent movements, in and out of the university, show, in a manner which cannot be mistaken, what may be expected, should that body, of which Mr. Newman is the general and Mr. Ward the champion, ever obtain uncontrolled ascendancy.

The groundwork of Mr. Ward's defence is this, if he has done wrong in thus forcing the articles, or, as Mr. Oakeley would say, extorting them, to speak sentiments which they do not

really mean, others are equally culpable with reference to the Prayer Book and its services. No man, he affirms, can subscribe to all the formulas in a natural sense, he has therefore done only what others do. But no recrimination, however just, can make wrong right. The moral quality of the action is the same, however many may participate in similar guilt. Such a plea may be valid against the infliction of punishment by those who are equally culpable; but it cannot give the character of rectitude to a violation of truth, nor justify a departure from honesty and good faith.

Mr. Ward, with great adroitness and force, charges those who hold evangelical doctrine especially with inconsistency in blaming him; but he has undoubtedly, in some instances, both overstated and misstated their principles. He has looked at their tenets through a medium of his own, which has presented them to his mind discoloured and distorted. He has drawn from their sentiments inferences which they who hold them deny; he has charged on all, what may have been found ultra in any, and has made no discrimination where many differences exist. It has been alleged in reply, that there is an important difference between articles of faith and forms of devotion, that it is by the former that the latter are to be interpreted, and that the expressions in the offices and services of the church, are, according to the 6th Article, to be interpreted by a reference to the scripture as the primary rule. Whatever force there may be in such a reply, certainly there is a wide difference in the position of the evangelical and the Romanist, who both subscribe. By education perhaps, by habit, and by strong predilection, those who decidedly hold evangelical truth, have become so accustomed to regard as accordant with their views, modes of expression, which to others appear quite opposed to them, that they are seldom, probably, aware of discrepancy. Romanists, in subscribing the Articles, perceive and acknowledge how decidedly they are against them, at least in their natural sense; and it was not till the publication of the jesuitical expedient proposed in Tract 90, that they knew how to reconcile their subscription to protestant articles with the belief in popish doctrines. Those who are evangelical do not professedly 'evade' the natural meaning of expressions, 'divorce the dry wording' from their spirit, and put a 'non-natural' signification on them; they do not admit, that while the obvious meaning of catechism or prayer book is 'as plain as words can make it on the (un)evangelical side,' they designedly explain it away, and put on it an unnatural sense; they do not claim the right of holding doctrines which they do not teach; they do not declare that their faith, their love, their sympathies are with another church which the articles of their own church evidently condemn; there

is no other ecclesiastical community which, while they enjoy the emoluments and advantages of the English church, they consider much nearer the scriptural truth, in which infallibility resides, from which it is a sin to separate, and to which the church of England, if she would listen to divine teaching, would return, seeking reconciliation with penitence for her long continued schism. There are then, we must, and we do cheerfully admit, notwithstanding the cleverness and ingenuity with which Mr. Ward has put the case, important particulars in which, while both make the same subscription, the evangelical portion of the church differ materially from the Romanists in their position; but still we must, in all fairness, say that Mr. Ward has pressed them with difficulties from which we see not how they can escape. We can have no wish to depreciate that portion of the established clergy with whose views of Christian doctrine we so nearly sympathize; but as parties unconnected with the litigants on either side, our verdict, given with impartiality, and after due deliberation, is, that they are not, and cannot be, entirely exonerated from the charges which Mr. Ward brings against them. If some of the 'formularies' are, as Mr. Newman acknowledges in his preface to Tract 90, 'ambiguous,' so that, while capable of another sense, each may fairly use them according to his own views, there are several parts of the church service and the catechism which cannot be taken in an evangelical sense without a very forced construction. A few instances briefly stated will be sufficient to show that we do not unadvisedly speak thus. Regeneration, according to the evangelical doctrine, is a divine change wrought in the soul, by the Holy Spirit of God, by means of the truth of the gospel, and is evermore accompanied by 'repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ;' consequently, baptismal regeneration is regarded as an error unscriptural and dangerous. But to us it appears undeniable that baptismal regeneration is, in the most distinct manner, taught in the church formularies. So far Mr. Ward and the tractarians are right. The object in bringing the infant to baptism is stated to be that he may receive what 'by nature he cannot have; that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost.' The prayer requests God to 'wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost'—'that he, coming to the holy baptism, may receive remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration.' And after the performance of the rite, the priest declares that 'this child is regenerate,' and thanks are presented that it hath pleased God 'to regenerate' the infant 'with his Holy Spirit.' As soon as the child can repeat his catechism, he is taught that in his baptism he was made 'a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.' When the child, now grown up into

youth, receives the rite of confirmation, his regeneration is thus recognized by the high authority of the bishop: 'Almighty and everlasting God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by water of the Holy Ghost, and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their sins,' &c. The doctrine of baptismal regeneration may be denounced as unscriptural, second only to transubstantiation in its absurdity, and probably exceeding it in its mischievous tendency, but to deny that it is the teaching of the Prayer-book is to fly in the face of common sense, and to destroy the legitimate use of words.

Passing by the visitation of the sick, which in its priestly absolution is as popish as any Romanist could wish, what can be said of the burial service? The evangelical minister believes that those only who 'die in the Lord' are blessed; that, without a renewed heart and a living faith in Christ, there is no hope of salvation. But when the infidel, the drunkard, the prostitute is placed in the grave, is not the priest obliged to declare that 'it hath pleased Almighty God of his great mercy to take unto himself the soul of the dear departed brother or sister, whose body is therefore committed to the ground 'in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life;' and to pronounce over him or her the blessing of those 'who die in the Lord'? There cannot possibly be any ambiguity here, as, after speaking of the happiness of the souls of the faithful whose departed spirits are with the Lord, it is added, 'We give Thee hearty thanks that it hath pleased Thee to deliver this our brother (or sister) out of the miseries of this sinful world.' How can these expressions be reconciled with evangelical belief? Must not Mr. Ward's mode of interpretation be here, to a certain extent, applied? Must not the plain meaning be 'evaded' or 'explained away,' and a sense put on the words, divorced from their spirit, altogether 'non-natural'?

And leaving those who profess evangelical truth, what party is there, of any principle or of no principle, that can entirely escape the sweeping condemnation of Mr. Ward? How can the liberal school subscribe their approbation to the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed? How can the Sabellians, or quasi Sabellians, and we are informed there are many—or the Arians of various shades, subscribe to its definitions? How can the numerous class of men who preach morality as the ground, in whole or in part, of our acceptance with God, sign the Article on justification by faith only? How can the rigid Calvinists of the school of Romaine, or that of Dr. Hawker, subscribe the thirty-first Article, or the decided Arminian, subscribe the seventeenth? Neither the Articles nor the Prayer-book will accord with the faith of some; and of those who feel perfect freedom in the one, many 'work in bondage' in the other. We believe Mr. Ward

was not far from the mark, when he said that the spirit of the teaching furnished by the Prayer-book is not only different from, but absolutely contradictory to that of the Articles; and that 'a great deal might be said on this point—that all heads of colleges, fellows, and clergymen of the church of England, had, as he felt sure they must have done, subscribed in a non-natural sense.'

If anything had been wanting to prove, in the most convincing manner, how completely subscription to articles and creeds has failed of its object, that deficiency has, we think, by the recent controversies, been amply supplied. Where is that 'consent touching true religion, and that avoiding of diversities of opinions,' which, in the royal 'declaration' of 'the supreme governor of the church of England,' constituted the very end for which these Articles were framed, and subscription to them demanded? In vain, by the Act of Uniformity, were two thousand of the most valuable and conscientious ministers ejected from their livings; what uniformity has been secured which is not hollow, insincere, deceptive?—a name without a thing; a sign without what is signified; a mere semblance of union externally exhibited, while, except where the apathy of spiritual death prevails, all is discord and disagreement. Opposite sentiments and irreconcilable antipathies still, as in every past period, prevail. And it is truly lamentable to consider what is the present condition of a church which has sacrificed with such profusion the property, the liberties, the lives of the holiest of men, to the idol of uniformity. Is it not now—and we speak it not with pleasure, we indulge in no unholy triumph—is it not now convulsed, divided, distracted with contentions; and besides embodying in its members and its clergy almost every form of doctrine orthodox and heterodox, with all the intermediate gradations, are there not parties of the most opposite sentiments ranged under their respective banners, waging with each other an internecine war? Are the universities, those nurseries of the clergy, and as we are told, the conservators of sound theology, harmonious in their teaching? Are the bishops, who claim to be the representatives of the apostles, agreed? Are the doctrines taught through one diocese consentaneous? Is the same gospel generally preached in the different pulpits of the same town? Is not the church of England at the present moment a kingdom divided against itself? Among all the controversies of the different bodies of evangelical nonconformists with each other, which, with all the evils connected with the warm discussion of those points on which conscientious men differ, exhibit a large amount of life, and health, and freedom, place a check in the peculiarities of each, and keep alive a spirit of enquiry, is there anything so lamentable as the strifes and conflicts now raging in the English church?

We all remember the panic into which the universities, especially that of Oxford, were thrown, when a measure passed the House of Commons to admit dissenters to the literary advantages of the academical course. It was not proposed that they should be eligible to divinity degrees, to fellowships, to tutorships, or to any of the high offices of the university, but simply that in institutions which should be national they might enjoy literary advantages, and take literary honours without being compelled to sign any test, or to perform any act to which a conscientious dissenter might reasonably object. But the very proposition was alarming; the Spanish armada could scarcely have inspired more terror. The tocsin was sounded, the beacons were lighted: 'To arms! To arms!' was the shout raised by resident, and re-echoed by non-resident members. 'The church is in danger,' was the battle cry, her seats of learning are threatened with a deluge of sectaries; and Oxford, proud in her orthodoxy, and fierce for uniformity, raised the banner of her Thirty-nine Articles, dashed the gates of her far famed seminary in the face of all who could not conscientiously subscribe, and with indignant vociferation exclaimed, '*procul, procul, este profani.*' And what have her tests, and her subscriptions, and her bigotry done for her? Have they prevented men of no religion, or men of any religion from sharing in all her advantages, and aspiring to all her honours? Have they excluded Arians, Pelagians, Latitudinarians, or avowed Roman catholics? Look at the members, the fellows, the tutors, the professors, and ask what uniformity has been secured; what barrier has been effectual to prevent the entrance even of popery, that great and inveterate antagonist of the English church? All whose consciences are pliable may now enter; only the conscientious are excluded. We trust that we may be permitted to say, and that with an honest pride, that we belong to a body of men who, though holding far more generally, and with greater tenacity than the majority of the English clergy, most of the leading doctrines which the Thirty-nine Articles embody, can still, and practically do say, 'It is true, we value highly the advantages enjoyed within your cloistered walls, we never gaze on your libraries, walk in your groves, or look up on those time honoured edifices, associated as they are with such inspiring recollections, without a sigh over that ungenerous and exclusive policy which forbids our entrance. But if the price of admission is the sacrifice of our honour, we throw all these advantages to the winds, and, acquiring what learning we can, and where we may, shall feel the high satisfaction of preserving our integrity unquestioned, and our conscience inviolate.'

But what is to be the next scene in this drama? Whither

will these proceedings against Mr. Ward carry the university? How can it now pause? Is not the Rubicon passed? And how will it now advance towards the only object which justifies the degradation of Mr. Ward, the securing of good faith in subscribing the Articles, and thus stopping that current of Romanism which is now rapidly flowing into the church? Unless this measure be followed up by others of an effective kind, little or nothing will have been accomplished towards cleansing the university from the leprosy which has infected it. Is the disciple to be made a victim and the master to be untouched? Is the accessory to be punished, and the principal to be allowed to go free? Is the convocation consistent in condemning 'The Ideal of a Christian Church,' and allowing the Tract 90 to pass uncensured, the very work which originated, as far as the present controversy is concerned, the principles for which Mr. Ward's book is condemned, and which now circulates so freely in the university, and is recommended so strongly to the junior members by the resident and tutorial tractarians? If nothing farther is done, the fermentation of this unholy leaven will most undoubtedly proceed, and Mr. Ward's joy will be full in beholding increasing 'numbers of English churchmen,' who embrace 'the whole cycle of Roman doctrine.' We have said that already a large body of the tutors are decided tractarians; and are the heads of houses free from Newmanism? May not the present minority, if things proceed as they have lately been going on, become a Romanizing majority? And what would be the consequence if, with such a majority, a vice-chancellor and two proctors of the same stamp should be elected to office? And does a review of the past ten years, or a consideration of the present state of the university render this improbable? But what *can* be done? Where is the remedy? The proceedings of the Hebdomadal Board have been already treated with the utmost contempt by the Puseyite party; the decision of the convocation has been set at nought as an illegal stretch of power, and a moral nullity, leaving the great question just where it stood. But the bishops, it is said, have declared most of them against the principle of subscription which Mr. Newman and others advocate. What check has this given to the heresy? Mr. Oakeley maintains in the very teeth of his own bishop, his right to hold all Roman catholic doctrines, while he continues his subscription to the Articles, and his enjoyment of church preferment. Will an appeal be made to the ecclesiastical courts? Can any decision of theirs eradicate the evil? Where does the power lie to apply a remedy? Is it in 'the three estates of the realm?' Will they venture to interfere? Is it safe to summon a convocation of the clergy? Will the illustrious Lady who is

Supreme Governor of the Church of England,' with the aid of her council, or the consent of her Parliament, take the matter in hand? What would be the end of such a beginning? We confess, and we know that many in the church participate in the same sentiment, that we see no light, no opening, no prospect of better things. All is uncertainty, confusion, dismay. Formerly the sectaries without were denounced, as placing the church in jeopardy, now her worst 'foes' are 'those of her own household.'

'O Navis referunt in mare te novi
Fluctus.'

A requisition was put forward, immediately after the convocation, requesting the Vice-Chancellor to adopt speedy measures for bringing the question of the condemnation of Tract 90 again before that house; it has, we believe, received up to the time of our writing about 500 signatures; but with such a number of signatures will the Hebdomadal Board hazard another defeat? We strongly suspect that there are influences at work which are not apparent, and which will effectually prevent the adoption of any stringent measures against tractarianism. No less than 500 names have, we understand, been appended to the address of thanks to the proctors who, on the 13th of February stopped the proceedings of the convocation on the question of Tract 90 by their veto, among which are those of high consideration both in church and state. The conflict it seems is but commencing, and the struggle will probably be desperate, before either party succumb. 'Be the result what it may,' says Mr. Garbett, 'it must be disastrous, and end in the further rending of the church.' (The University, the Church, and the New Test, p. 5.) 'God's wrath,' he continues, 'has brought upon us, in the shape of schism and faction, real danger, and possible destruction.' 'The church is bleeding her life away, and must rest or die.' Mr. Oakeley, who, with all his Romanism, professes much attachment to the church of England, thus addresses the Bishop of London, when entreating him to pause. 'If we tamper with a body of such delicate structure, and such heterogeneous materials, or enforce or enfeeble either of the powers on whose gentle and well poised sway it depends for the equability of its movements, my own deep and deliberate apprehension is that it will break up, and its dissociated parts fly away in obedience to some more powerful attraction, or wheel their restless and self-chosen course round and round the dreary regions of space. This, its brittleness and want of inward balance, *might*, indeed, be a proof that it had never been a divine work at all, at least, as to its essential frame work; but they might also tend to shew that, though a divine work, it has not been treated as

God would have it treated.' (Letter to the Lord Bishop of London, p. 38.)

There seems to be a provision in nature by which, in many cases, evils work their own remedy. The storm purifies the atmosphere; violent disturbances in the functions of animal life, not unfrequently by throwing out of the system the elements of mischief which had been gathering, lead to renovated health. And should such be the termination of the present disastrous commotions, it will be worth all the struggles and difficulties through which the church of England is now passing. The best result that we can hope for is, that they may hasten on the period of her emancipation, when delivered from the incubus of state patronage, freed from the bondage of state controul, and thrown on her own resources, she may have power to rid herself not only of her Romanizing priests who are undermining her doctrine, but also of her ambitious and worldly-minded ministers who degrade her character and destroy her usefulness; when she may have full liberty to amend her constitution, revise her liturgy, and enforce her discipline; then, retaining as many bishops as she pleased, and adopting what forms she thought most for her edification, other christian communities, no longer oppressed or insulted by her, would cheerfully extend the right hand of fellowship, and hail her as a welcome and powerful ally in the diffusion of truth and righteousness throughout the world.

Art. II. *The History of Guernsey; with occasional Notices of Jersey, Alderney, and Sark.* By Jonathan Duncan, Esq., B.A. London: Longman and Co. Svo. pp. 654.

2. *A Letter addressed to Mr. Advocate Tupper, in Vindication of the Conduct of Major-General Napier, Lieutenant-Governor of Guernsey.* By J. Bowditch. Jefferys and Co., 123, Chancery Lane.

3. *Observations of Advocate Tupper, of Guernsey, in Answer to Mr. Bowditch.* Guernsey. Brouard.

4. *Authentic Report of the Evidence taken before the Royal Court of the Island of Guernsey, relative to certain Charges of Conspiracy and Sedition. Also of the Trials instituted thereon; and of the Correspondence between the Royal Court and Her Majesty's Government, from the 4th day of June to the 10th day of August, 1844; taken chiefly from the Records of the Royal Court.* Guernsey: Brouard.

MR. DUNCAN'S volume named above, was published in the year 1841. The principal materials for it, were derived from orders in council, acts of parliament, and ordinances of the Royal Court of Guernsey. The work is highly creditable to the research and ability of the author; and is, we think, quite a model of the most useful kind of historical

composition. The writer's aim evidently was to state facts, rather than to give opinions. He has often been referred to as an authority, in the recent pleadings before the Privy Council. It may be right to add, that the book is neither a cheap, nor a popular one. Its very excellence renders it a book for the few.

Most of the readers of this journal were taught at school to name, as among the British possessions, Jersey, Guernsey, Alderney, and Sark: yet till recently little more was known of these places, than of the Falkland Islands, or the Azores. Mr. Inglis's work on the Channel Islands excited much attention, and considerably increased the number of visitors to the scenes he described: but the great majority of even intelligent people in this country, are still ignorant of the history, character, and customs, of the islanders, who, dwelling within the arms of a French bay, are among the most devotedly loyal of all the subjects of Britain: and who, living under the same sceptre as ourselves, and near to our own shores, are free from the burden of debt, of heavy taxes, of a landed aristocracy, of a standing army, of an expensive administration. The simple institutions of these people well deserve the study of statesmen.

'The happiest community, which it has ever been my lot to fall in with, is to be found in the little island of Guernsey How is it that Guernsey should be so much ahead in the career of happiness? *Guernsey has superior laws — superior institutions.*'

So wrote, in 1832, Frederic Hill, Esqr., the government inspector of prisons, who had twice visited the island under circumstances favourable for becoming acquainted with its condition. Nothing has since occurred to render inapplicable his glowing eulogium.

During the past year, the island authorities have been brought, several times, into collision with the imperial government; and public attention has thus been directed to them. Some account of the islands, and the recent disputes connected with them, will not therefore be deemed unseasonable, or uninteresting.

Nearly 100 miles to the south west of Southampton is Alderney, an island about eight miles in circuit. Twenty miles further in the same direction is Guernsey, which is nine and a half miles long, and five and a half in extreme breadth; and no spot in which is more than two miles from the sea. Still twenty miles onward—or reckoning from port to port thirty—and bearing to the south-east, is Jersey, twelve miles in length, and seven in extreme breadth. Between the two last-mentioned places, is the remarkable little island of Sark; and between Sark and Guernsey are Herm and Jethou, mere rocks covered with scanty herbage, and having, the former, but a few houses upon it, the latter three

only. As seen from Guernsey, the appearance of these various islands, studding the sea, and becoming more or less distinct with every change of the atmosphere, and every alternation of light and shade, is exceedingly picturesque.

By every one, who has admired the 'tall ancestral trees' of England, the want of timber is at once felt as a great deficiency in the Channel Islands. Whether it be owing to the absence of all shelter from the winds, or to other causes, we are unable to say; but not one fine tree, like the forest trees of our own country, is any where to be seen. With this exception, however, the traveller will find little to check his admiration, and very much to awaken it. To those who wish for the mild but bracing air of the sea, it were difficult to select more agreeable places of resort. All the islands excepting Alderney—with which there is no regular steam communication—are easily accessible: and if our readers purpose to repair, for a month or so, to the vicinity of the sea, we can assure them that they will be highly gratified by a trip to the Channel Islands. At an expense, scarcely greater, perhaps less, than that incurred by a sojourn at Ramsgate or Brighton, they may combine, with saline breezes in perfection, scenery beautiful and varied, and a state of society which, to an Englishman, is novel and instructive.

The largest of these islands, Jersey, is the most populous and lively. In the interior it is well wooded, though the trees are not large; well cultivated; and pleasantly diversified. Some of its views are surpassingly beautiful. From Prince's Tower, for example, where the eye commands a considerable part of the island, and, looking across the sea, discerns a long range of the French coast, and on a clear day may distinguish the cathedral of Coutances, the stranger tears himself away with great reluctance.

Sark is a mountain three miles long and one broad, rising around its whole circumference, precipitously from the sea; and is accessible on the one side, only by the aid of a rope; on the other, by landing in a small nook, where a tunnel bored under the beetling rock, leads to the upper part of the island.

As the voyager approaches Guernsey, he sees St. Peter's Port, its only town, nestling in the bosom of a small bay. The houses come down to the beach, and cover the side and crown the summit of the rather high and steep ascent; being, on the rising ground, very generally interspersed with gardens and green-houses. The suburbs of the town surprise the visitor, by the number of genteel residences they contain, each one adorned with luxuriant evergreens and flowers. In the interior of the island are several villages; and though the population is four

times as dense as in Ireland, there is no crowding. Every cottage has its garden, which is well stored with shrubs and flowers, and very rarely neglected. Indeed, the passion for gardening, ornamental as well as useful, is among the most striking characteristics of the natives of this charming island. They are distinguished also by simplicity, honesty, enterprise, and independence. Existence among them is enjoyed, not endured; and certainly, as compared with the people of our own beloved but misgoverned country, they are a thriving, contented, and happy race.*

The coast scenery of all these islands is captivating. Here, the traveller pursues his way through a deep and winding valley, to the quiet and sandy beach. There, he climbs to the edge of the abyss, and seating himself on a huge crag, looks far down on the rock-bound coast, and finds a strange delight in the sweep and shriek of the sea-gull, and the cauldron overflowing with the foam of the wildest surges. Or yonder, with careful footsteps, he picks his way along the steep and rugged descent, till he finds himself by the water's edge, with stupendous precipices of solid rock towering behind him, a wild cavern yawning at his right hand, the beach strewn with rocky fragments of every size and form, while here and there a vast pile of rock stands bare and erect amidst the spray.

At the time of the Conquest, the Channel Islands were a part of the duchy of Normandy; and they remained so, as long as the English kings held possession of that province. When John lost his continental territory, the islanders remained faithful to him. Being thus completely severed from the seat of government at Rouen, it became necessary to give them new laws. These were framed according to Norman customs, and are to this day styled the constitutions of King John. If a Guernseyman be asked when his country became subject to England, his quick reply is, that England is the subjected country, and that the Normans were the conquerors. Many of the ancient customs and privileges still exist; and the ancient language, Norman French, still struggles, though in vain, for the precedence.

The institutions of the several islands are substantially the same. It will suffice, therefore, to explain those of Guernsey, which have recently undergone a slight reform by a bill, passed in the island legislature on the 9th of June, 1843, and the

* Barbet's Guide to Guernsey will be found a very useful handbook. Unlike the generality of books of its class, it is filled with really useful information, and without the ordinary intermixture of garish description and bad poetry. We may mention also a very usefully constructed, and cheap pocket map, published by Moss.

royal assent to which was communicated on the 26th of December last.

To render the explanation as clear as possible, we will first exhibit the judicial and legislative authorities assembled; and afterwards explain the mode of their appointment.

Will the reader imagine himself crossing the hall of a substantial building, and entering, not at either end but by the side, a moderate sized room? Fine portraits of Sir John Doyle and Lord Seaton, and full length portraits of Lord de Saumarez, and the late eminent bailiff, Daniel De Lisle Brock, Esq., adorn the walls. The room itself is plain, and yet wears an air of thorough respectability. To the left of the visitor, as he enters, there rise from the floor, seats for perhaps two hundred people. At his right there are also seats arranged for official persons. This is the court-house, where justice is administered. It is also the parliament house.

Suppose the proceedings to be judicial. At his right, the visitor observes on a raised and distinguished seat the bailiff, who is the highest civil functionary on the island, and has a salary of £300 a year. On the right and left of the bailiff are other gentlemen, not less than seven; if all are present, twelve. These are called jurats. Together with the bailiff, they act in all important civil and criminal causes, as both judge and jury: and from their decision there is no appeal excepting to the queen in council. Below the bailiff and jurats, and at their right hand, is the attorney-general, who has a salary of £200 yearly: at their left and before them, are seats for the advocates and others connected with the causes tried. Such is the court of justice. The proceedings are carried on in the French language, but witnesses are examined in English, if they speak it. The jurats listen to the pleadings and the evidence; question the witnesses if they think it necessary; and when the trial is completed, give their verdict aloud, one by one, generally assigning the reasons for it. The bailiff commonly gives a summary of the cause; and then pronounces the opinion of the majority of the jurats, which is the sentence of the court. If there be an equality of votes, the bailiff has a casting vote. There is no display in the court house. Neither counsel nor judges wear any official dress. The proceedings are marked by much less technicality, and much more common sense, than our own courts of justice. May this people ever beware of apeing the follies of their neighbours, and retain their own dignified simplicity! For it they are pre-eminent. Should they ever stoop to become imitators, they can never get beyond an humble mimicry of that which is useless and effeminate in the customs of England.

Enter the same place when the legislature, or "States of Deliberation," are assembled: and, if all the members be pre-

sent, there are the bailiff, the twelve jurats, eight rectors of parishes, the attorney-general, six deputies of St. Peter's Port, and nine deputies from the other parishes: in all thirty-seven. That is the parliament. In cases where a question is not decided by two-thirds of the members present, the president (the bailiff) may, if he think fit, submit it a second time, within one month, when it is decided by a majority of votes. By this body the general affairs of the island, *including its taxation*, are managed. Its proceedings are public by sufferance. The military governor—of whom more will be said hereafter—has a right to be present and speak, but not to vote. The relation of this local legislature to the British parliament, has given rise to some serious difficulties; and would, but for the spirit of the inhabitants, and their ancient and cherished charters, have sunk the people into thorough dependence and beggary.

It will be observed that the bailiff, jurats, and attorney-general, are functionaries both in the judicial court and in the legislature. When they sit as legislators, they are joined by eight clergymen and fifteen deputies. The bailiff and attorney-general are appointed by the crown; which appointment, however, is commonly a formal way of executing the wish of the Guernsey authorities. The clergymen sit in the parliament *ex officio*. The other members are appointed by the people as follows. The rate-payers in the parish choose persons to manage their parochial affairs. These persons elect the deputies in the several parishes. When a jurat dies, the bailiff, the surviving jurats, the attorney-general, the eight clergymen, and all the parochial authorities, form one elective body, for appointing his successor. The appointment is for life, the yearly fees are not more than £15, and the person elected must serve, under pain of imprisonment or expatriation. Every man in Guernsey is bound to serve his country when called upon to do so by the public voice. The same elective body appoints the sheriff, to whose office there is annexed a salary of uncertain amount. The entire number of electors is 222; but it will be borne in mind that they never act as a body, excepting in the choice of a jurat or sheriff.

The mode of electing the deputies requires and deserves a little further explanation. In each of the country parishes, the rate-payers choose yearly two constables. The same parties choose also other officers called douzeniers, the number of the latter being generally twelve. They are chosen for life: their service is compulsory and without pay. No one is qualified for the office who has not been constable. These constables and douzeniers regulate the parochial assessments. In the collection of such taxes as are levied on property, they occupy the place of the income-tax commissioners in England, and their task is

usually an easy one. They also attend to the streets, roads, boundaries, drainage, &c. In short, they are a sort of corporation in each parish; the senior constable being the chairman of their meetings. By the recent Reform Bill, the populous and wealthy parish of St. Peter's Port is to have five such corporate bodies; but the parochial authority is to remain almost exclusively with one of the five.

The number, then, of these corporations—so we may call them—is fourteen; namely, one for each of the country parishes, and five for the town. Of these, one sends two deputies to the legislature; the remaining thirteen return one deputy each. The election is for one session only, there being several sessions during the year.

Every man in Guernsey, unless in very special cases of exemption, is trained to arms; and is thus prepared in case of invasion, to defend his rock-bound home. The island is also protected by the dangerous navigation of the surrounding seas—the danger arising both from the rocks and the currents. None but practised and skilful seamen can venture there. If the reader should ever pass from Guernsey to Sark in the neat little cutter which runs between those places daily, he may have an opportunity of admiring the style in which she is made to thread a triangle of rocks, where but for the turn of the helm at the right instant, the vessel must inevitably strike. The English government, however, deeming the island both important and insecure from its proximity to France, has planted cannon all round it, but from their small calibre and short range they would at present prove totally inefficient. On the heights above the town there is an extensive and strong fortification, which cost, certainly more than £200,000, and, we have been told, more than half a million sterling. A military governor—now General W. F. Napier—resides on the island, and the garrison is entirely under his control. He has also the regulation of the island militia, which, during the last war, was very effective. Sir John Doyle said, that with it alone, he would undertake to defend the island against any attack of the French. The garrison expenses, including the erection of the works, are borne by that pay-master general, John Bull. The military governor is the patron of all the church livings.

The mischievous custom of primogeniture and entail, as existing in England, is, in Guernsey, unknown; and the law verges, to say the least, towards a contrary extreme. The owner of landed property may sell it at any time; but, if he have children, he cannot bequeath it. The law divides it among all his children, giving however some advantage to the eldest son. In consequence of this arrangement, there are no large

landed estates, and scarcely any tenants, but a great number of small and independent proprietors. It is delightful to witness the sturdy and dignified manhood of the little cultivators of Guernsey, as contrasted with the servility of too many of the yeomanry of England. The late bailiff, Mr. Brock—one of the most enlightened politicians of modern times—strongly recommended a similar plan of partition, as a panacea for the evils of Ireland. The testimony of such a man, whose views were founded on the experience of three quarters of a century, is weighty. His arguments are clear and conclusive; and may be seen in Mr. Duncan's volume, page 307.

The taxation of Guernsey is very light. It may be quickly explained under two heads:—first, the parochial taxation; and secondly, the taxation for the general purposes of government.

The parochial taxation is raised in each parish by the corporation already described, having been previously voted by a general meeting of the rate-payers. It is a property tax. In the country parishes no one is charged with this tax, who has not possessions worth £100. In the town, taxation commences with those who are worth £200. All kinds of property are included in the calculation, even household furniture. This tax amounts to about 3s. 4d. per cent. per annum; and by it provision is made for the poor, and for all other parochial expenses, such as lighting, public pumps, &c. It is humiliating to be compelled to add, that no inconsiderable part of this burden is imposed on the people of Guernsey by the United Kingdom. Mr. Brock, writing in 1840 to Lord Normanby, said:—

‘ Out of 261 inmates (in the town workhouse) 109 are strangers, or born of strangers, almost all of whom are English, Scotch, or Irish, whereas in all England, it would be difficult to find a single Guernsey pauper.’

The expenses of the general government are defrayed by publicans' licences, a duty of 1s. a gallon on spirits, and the harbour dues; which together suffice for the payment of salaries, for keeping in repair the excellent roads of the island without any turnpike gates, for coast defences against the inroads of the sea, for public buildings, harbours, &c. The revenue amounts to about £7,500. Should it at any time prove insufficient, the States have the power, by a vote of two-thirds of their number, of levying a small property tax, which would be collected in the same way as the parochial property tax.

The Channel Islands, it will be seen, are free from the intolerable burdens and annoyances of English taxation. There are no custom-house officers to vex the traveller, no excisemen to intrude upon the tradesman: there is no long array of tax

gatherers, no host of well paid commissioners. There are no indirect taxes stealthily filching from the purchaser a large part of every shilling he expends. Tenpence is the regular price for three pounds of good moist sugar, excellent coffee is sold for 10d. or 1s. the pound, and good tea at 2s. 5d. And even from these prices a considerable reduction is to be made. The pound weight is more than 17 oz. of our standard, making a difference of $8\frac{2}{3}$ per cent.; and English money is always at a considerable premium. These two causes reduce the tea quoted at 2s. 5d. to 2s. English, and other articles in proportion.

The islands have repeatedly been troubled by the intermeddling of the British Parliament or Ministry: and well do these parts of their history exemplify the words of Solomon: 'wisdom is a defence.' When England was attempting by the legerdemain of an act of parliament to make a pound note and a shilling worth a guinea, though, de facto, a guinea would buy a pound note and six shillings, the Guernsey-men saw no mystery in the currency question, but very wisely determined to *say* their money was worth, what every body knew it was really worth. Accordingly, in 1811, and again in 1812, the merchants under the presidency of Mr. Brock, unanimously resolved to raise the denominative value of the coin then current among them; and by this natural expedient, they prevented what would otherwise have inevitably followed, the disappearance of a metallic currency from the island. In 1836 Sir. R. Peel intimated an intention of introducing the British currency into the Channel Islands. Mr. Brock, in a letter relating to this proposal, touched the general question of the currency with the hand of a master, shewed the ruinous consequences of Sir R. Peel's measure in England, and assigned various special reasons why the contemplated change could not be made in Guernsey: and the affair dropped. In 1821 an act, of which the islanders had no notice, received the royal assent, closing the ports of the Channel Islands against wheat, when it was under 80s in England. This was quite a new thing to people accustomed to have their ports open to the productions of all the world, duty free: and the effect of the measure would have been to raise the price of wheat (as often as the price in England was under 80s) to more than double the price for which, after a good harvest, it sells in the islands: and this too among a people dependent, to a great extent, on foreign growth for their very existence. 'Is it possible,' asked Mr. Brock, 'that any intention should exist to take away the very means of our subsistence?' He came over to England together with one of the jurats, to remonstrate, and the obnoxious clause was repealed the next session. In 1834 the agriculturalists of the West of England complained that foreign corn was smuggled

into this country as the produce of the Channel Islands. A blundering report was obtained on the subject, and the President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Baring, introduced a bill to deprive the islanders of their ancient right of sending their home grown corn, free of duty, into the English market. Mr. Brock again took the field, accompanied by two deputies from Jersey. They obtained a committee of the House of Commons, triumphantly disproved the allegations of the report on which the pending measure was founded, which was in consequence withdrawn. We cannot forbear extracting the conclusion of a long letter, addressed by Mr. Brock to the Right Honourable Henry Goulburn, and bearing date April 9th, 1835, as a specimen of the manly bearing of this enlightened patriot, when approaching the imperial government.

‘It is unfortunately true, that the agricultural interest is depressed. It is wrong, it is ridiculous, to ascribe any part of that depression to the Channel Islands. The four islands do not contain 25,000 acres fit for cultivation—meadows, orchards, and gardens included. How can this, with any man of reflexion, be held up as an object of jealousy to the landholders, many of whom are owners of estates to a larger extent? Our connexion with England can indeed in no way be injurious to her; her commodities, produce, and manufactures, are freely admitted, to an amount exceeding ten-fold the value of our produce which she so reluctantly takes in return. The trifling quantity of corn exported from the islands, and which the commissioners of customs cannot make to be more than 2,151 quarters of wheat, and 86½ quarters of barley, annually *from all the islands* on the average of five years, is not sufficient to feed one-half, or anything like one-half, of the persons employed in England for the supply of the islands. England trades with no part of the world so advantageously as with the islands, in proportion to their extent. The goods exported by her to the islands amount to at least £500,000, while the produce she takes back does not amount to £120,000;—must we receive all, and send nothing back? Such a system is too barbarous for the 19th century, and how it could enter into the thoughts of those specially appointed for the encouragement of trade is inconceivable. Some persons are disposed to account for it by reasons unconnected with trade, and dependant only on local and agricultural prejudices; if so, it is in vain to argue; and all I must say is, that I cannot think it possible that any statesman should be found, in this country, ready to sacrifice the rights and interests of the smallest community, for the purpose of flattering such prejudices, and should venture to do so, because the community injured is weak and helpless.

Confident in the justice of our cause, and in the honour as well as justice of his Majesty’s Government, I have, &c.’

We were one day accosted by a beggar in Guernsey, and as this is by no means a common occurrence in that part of the

Queen's dominions, it excited much curiosity. The girl (her age might be fourteen) said her father was ill in bed, and the family had no bread to eat. She gave her name and place of abode. A careful enquiry was instituted, and the following authentic information obtained. The man was in good health, and in full work, and in receipt of 15s a week. The house he lived in, with about two-fifths of an acre of land adjoining, were his own, subject to a mortgage payment of not more than one pound a year. This girl was the only beggar seen or heard of, during a month's sojourn in the Channel Islands.

The religious aspect of the islands is very like that of Great Britain. The established church is isolated, and strives to be dominant there, as here. The Methodists are very numerous, and to this active body of christians great praise is due for the diffusion of evangelical instruction throughout the islands. There are Independents, Baptists, &c., as in this country. There are a few catholics in Guernsey, who meet in a neat chapel. In Jersey they have lately built a commodious chapel. The population of St. Peter's Port, the only town in Guernsey, is between fourteen and fifteen thousand; the episcopalian places of worship supply 4602 sittings; and the various meeting-houses belonging to other bodies, 5991. In the year 1750, there were no dissenters of any kind on the island.

It remains to give some account of the disputes which have lately agitated the islands, and to which the leading journals of England have frequently referred. Both Jersey and Guernsey have been brought into collision with the Home Government, but from causes *totally distinct and unconnected*: so that the vindication of Guernsey would leave the dispute of Jersey untouched, and *vice versa*. The Guernsey controversy has called forth the pamphlet of Mr. Bowditch, which is a document of but little interest, excepting as it has elicited the crushing reply of Mr. Tupper.

The Lieutenant-Governor of Guernsey is Major-General Napier, famous both as a soldier, and an author; but apparently unfitted for civic duties, by his military habits and imperious temper. He has recklessly involved himself in a succession of disputes with the royal court; and his conduct has been petulant, overbearing, and fatuitous. The historian of the Peninsular war has certainly placed himself in a position, in which every one who admires his chivalrous character, and did admire his liberal professions, will grieve to see him.

In the month of June 1843, General Napier, having been informed that a Frenchman named Du Rocher, who had committed bigamy in Jersey, was residing in Guernsey, determined to have him arrested, with the presumed intention of sending

him out of the island. Du Rocher concealed himself in the house of a Mr. Orchard, a British resident, in whose family he was French preceptor. Mr. Orchard had a French servant named Le Conte. The police finding that this servant knew something about Du Rocher, questioned him; but he evaded their enquiries. Du Rocher, soon after, quitted Guernsey. The governor, vexed at his escape, caused Le Conte to be imprisoned, on the charge of 'having annoyed the constable in the execution of his duty;' and the following morning, commanded that he should be expelled from the islands; thus banishing not the master, but the servant, for keeping his master's secret. This act of stern authority in an island where there are hundreds of French residents, occasioned great ferment. The constable having admitted the expulsion, was asked by the royal court, whose subordinate he was, by whose authority he had acted; and he named the governor. The court (i. e. the bailiff and jurats) then sought, according to their right and custom, an explanatory interview with the governor, who appointed the 9th of October as the time, and his private residence as the place; but instead of receiving the court with the respect due to their station, or with the courtesy of a gentleman, he had the chairs removed from the room, except an elevated one for himself, declined to enter into the conference specially provided for by his oath of office, and dismissed the gentlemen who had waited on him in a friendly and conciliatory spirit, with contumely. Out of these proceedings two questions arose—the question of the governor's power of banishment, and the further question of the right of the royal court to decent treatment when they applied for a free and friendly conference.

On the 1st of January 1844, a number of soldiers met, on the public road, an Englishman named Clark, and his wife, and in a violent and cowardly way assaulted them, leaving Clark in such a state that the medical attendant declared, on oath, he could not answer for his life. A constable was sent to the Fort to claim the offenders. Three were recognised, and removed to jail, the name of one being Thomas Fossey. This man was convicted, 'on evidence as conclusive as was ever heard in a court of justice,' of a most cruel, unprovoked, and cowardly assault, and sentenced to two months' imprisonment. The next morning, without making the slightest enquiry of or reference to the crown lawyers, General Napier wrote to Sir James Graham, and obtained a free pardon. Nor was this all. The writ of pardon should have been, according to custom, first conveyed to the court and registered, and then executed through the sheriff. General Napier went himself to the jail, presented the document, and ordered the turnkey to release the prisoner.

That officer hesitated, and wished to consult his superior. The general immediately commanded the fort-major to bring down troops and force the jail; to avoid which catastrophe, the turnkey complied with the order. The whole island took the alarm at these unequivocal indications of military despotism. The governor was not a man to halt in his purpose. He bade the law officers prosecute the turnkey on a charge of disobedience. He was tried on the third of March, and unanimously acquitted.

The excitement continued, and was again fanned, when, on the 30th of March, the governor, without provocation, taxed by letter, one of the jurats, Sir William Collings, with having, as a judge on the bench, been guilty towards him, her Majesty's representative, of infamy, falsehood, dishonour, and the breach of his word as a gentleman: which monstrous attack induced Sir William, on the 2nd of April, to appeal to the Lord President of the Privy Council.

These various causes of difference remaining unsettled, on the 20th of May, there arrived her Majesty's steamer *Dee*, with a Queen's Messenger, and her Majesty's steamer *Blazer*, with the dépôt companies of the 23rd, 42nd, and 97th Regiments, from the Isle of Wight. They were followed, on the 21st and 22nd, by other bodies of soldiers. On the 23rd orders were issued that the island militia should not turn out on the 24th, to celebrate the Queen's birth-day, as they had been wont to do.

The landing of the soldiers took the natives by surprise. Every one was at his wits' end to know for what possible purpose they had been sent: some supposed a war was about to break out with France; others, that O'Connell was about to be imprisoned in Castle Cornet, a Guernsey fortress; a few, that General Napier had sent for the troops,—which, however, he denied. The truth soon leaked out: the six hundred soldiers had been despatched to quell a conspiracy against the life of the governor! A conception more absolutely ridiculous was never entertained. That there might be a wicked man, or a few wicked men, in Guernsey, who would be guilty of such a plot, was a possibility none could deny; but that there should be any general conspiracy, requiring a body of troops to put it down, will appear to everyone acquainted with the people, quite incredible. General Napier would not commit a more laughable blunder, if he were to charge such a plot on the 'Maternal Society.' If the natives had been told that they were angels and had wings, or demons and had tails, they could scarcely have been more astounded than when they heard they were conspirators. In due time the whole affair came to trial, and underwent a very searching and lengthened scrutiny; fifteen days being, in whole or in part,

devoted to it. The General attended the sittings of the court and frequently questioned the witnesses.

Strange to say, though an army had been sent for the governor's defence, the persons accused were only five. Two of these five had sought, some months before, to resign their commissions in the militia, on the ground of some dissatisfaction with the promotion of another officer. The General would not allow them to resign. A friend interposed: the affair was settled amicably: the letters on the subject were burnt, the General himself having given them up for that purpose, 'and with the understanding and promise that there should be no further question of their contents.'* Will it be credited that copies of these letters were produced on the trial? We do not profess to be very conversant with the soldier's code of honour, but should have expected that the author of the History of the Peninsular War would rather have been shot than allow these copies of letters to see the light, especially as they were in no way connected with the alleged conspiracy.

Of the five accused persons two were set at liberty, after an examination answering to that of a grand jury in England. The remaining three were brought to trial. The witnesses were in number eight, but three of them only gave testimony bearing on any of the accused. These were the Rev. Daniel Dobrée, and Mr. and Mrs. Waterman. Of these three, the first made himself notorious a few months ago by a letter in the 'Times,' the object of which was to prove himself of sound mind: of which sanity he gave rather strange evidence on the 13th of March. The parishioners being assembled on that day for a public purpose in the churchyard, the reverend gentleman took up his post in the church, fastened the windows with nails and gimblets, placed the union-jack over the pulpit, clothed himself in a surplice, and in that array stood at one of the windows making grimaces at his assembled neighbours.† As to his testimony on the trial, it is sufficient to say, that the counsel for the prosecution abandoned it as worthless.‡ Waterman and his wife deposed that two of the accused had talked in their shop about shooting General Napier, and that they had done this in the presence and hearing of a man of the name of Smith; who being called, declared he had never heard any such words, either there or anywhere else.

A more disgraceful cause never came before a court of justice. The whole affair is a romance, and nothing is wanting to make it complete but the production of the correspondence between General Napier and Sir James Graham, for which we trust some member will move in the present session of parliament.

* Authentic Report, p. 61. † Authentic Report, pp. 40, 43. ‡ Ibid, p. 77.

The various items which have been explained make up the case at issue between General Napier and the people of Guernsey. That case has been heard before the Privy Council. Notwithstanding the efforts made to repress enquiry by technical objections, the decision is, on the whole, favourable to the people.*

The Jersey cause is still undecided; and grievous is it to observe the ignorance and prejudice with which it has been discussed in the public journals of this country. We have no love for Jersey: it is plagued by party spirit to an extent of which, even in England, we can hardly form a conception; the moral tone of the island is far lower than in Guernsey, and it lacks the exquisite cottage-homes of the sister island. Yet there are signs of improvement, among which may be mentioned the establishment, on the 3rd of January last, of a new English newspaper, free from the low-lived asperities which have been an utter disgrace to the community tolerating them.

In May last an Englishman, Mr Charles Carus Wilson, published an insulting letter to the lieutenant-governor of Jersey, Major-General Sir Edward Gibbs. A public meeting of the native and English inhabitants of St. Helier's was convened to express indignation at this wanton attack. The chief magistrate of the town, Mr. Le Sueur, presided. Mr. Wilson sent a written apology to the government-house, and then published a libel on Mr. Le Sueur, who brought an action against him. On the trial, Wilson insulted and bullied the court; he shook his fist at the judges, brandished a brandy bottle, poured out a glass and tossed it off with an insulting gesture to the bench, told the court it was corrupt, boasted that he would galvanize the judges, &c. After long forbearance, he was sentenced to pay a fine of ten pounds to the Queen, and to apologize to the bench. He refused to do either, and was imprisoned. In prison his treatment has been as lenient as possible. He has applied in England for a writ of Habeas Corpus, which would remove the cause to Westminster. The writ has been granted. *Is it legal?* That is the sole question at issue; and it will soon be decided before the proper tribunal. All the eloquence, therefore, of the newspapers about 'a monstrous anomaly,' and 'the sovereignty of the Queen,' &c., is mere waste of words.

* In taking leave of Guernsey, we may mention the possible existence of a document which might, just now, be of no small interest, could it be discovered. The following is from Bridges's History of Northamptonshire, published in 1791:—'In the library at Kirby, the seat of Lord Hatton, is a MS. account of the island Guernsey, written by the first Lord Hatton, said to be admirably well done, and ready for the press.'—vol ii. p. 315.

The first Lord Hatton died in 1670. We have made inquiry after this MS., but without success.

In order that an act of the imperial parliament may become law in the Channel Islands, two things are said to be requisite: the islands must be named in the act, and the act must be registered in the islands, having been transmitted for that purpose by the Privy Council. The Habeas Corpus Act has the first of these requisites, but lacks the second. Nor could it be made to run into those parts of the Queen's possessions, without infringing the constitution there enjoyed. Its effect, moreover, would be to render justice complicated, expensive, and tardy. The right of the inhabitants to be tried in their own local courts is 'one of their most ancient and vital privileges.'*

In the year 1831 some paupers—children of soldiers—were sent to Guernsey, from St. Pancras, London. The island authorities denied that the paupers were chargeable on the island, and refused to allow Capes, the beadle of St. Pancras, to leave without them. Some months after, Capes and the paupers being still on the island, the parish of St. Pancras obtained from Lord Tenterden a writ of Habeas Corpus for the beadle. When his lordship's tipstaff appeared in Guernsey, the Royal Court immediately refused to make any return to the writ. Lord Tenterden then issued a warrant for the apprehension of the deputy sheriff, by whom Capes was detained. The tipstaff, who served this warrant on the 7th of May, was himself forthwith given into custody, taken before the court, and told that he had no authority in Guernsey. The Government now interfered, and an order of the Privy Council was sent, bearing date June 11, 1832, requiring the Habeas Corpus Act to be registered in the islands. The authorities in both Jersey and Guernsey, resolved to suspend such registry till they had remonstrated. Deputies repaired to London, Mr. Brock being one. The Order in Council was abandoned, the act was not registered, the beadle and paupers returned to London.

The institutions of the Channel Islands are not indeed perfect, but they are such as the people venerate for their antiquity and love for their fruits. Why should they be deprived of them? We trust that the good sense of the British public will prevent such a catastrophe. Let the institutions in question be amended where they need reform; but let them not be dealt with in ignorance or prejudice.

* The Jersey authorities have admitted the jurisdiction of the Court of Queen's Bench. They should have declined it, and the whole case would then have been argued before the Privy Council.

Art. III.—*Le Juif Errant, the Wandering Jew.* A Tale. By Eugene Sue.

THE Eclectic is not in the habit of devoting its pages to works of fiction of a questionable character, which, whatever mental stimulus they may minister to people who read nothing else, are too frequently but the evaporations of disordered brains, and calculated only to derange the brains of others. Such is, in general, the character of French novels; and yet it is for a French novel that we depart from our rule. This renders an explanation necessary.

The minister for public instruction, the '*Grand Maître*' of the French university, Villemain, has lately been declared raving mad. Those who have long known this unprincipled and heartless sophist, may wonder that a man so utterly devoid of all kinds of affection should have been subject to such a visitation, but the fact is officially notified, and there can therefore be no doubt about it. The cause of this sudden attack of insanity is differently reported. The first version which was obtained from parties, whose means of information and accuracy are well ascertained, gives a striking exemplification of the working of constitutional government in France.

The administrative tyranny, which is the only thing secured by the constitution of the country, has, during the last fourteen years, gradually reduced to a most abject state of subserviency and helplessness all classes of the people but one, the catholic clergy, the sole organized body now left in France, in some sort independent of the governmental centralisation. It is in the nature of the catholic clergy, and indeed of every state priesthood, to aspire to absolute authority, to place the divine power, with which they pretend to be invested, above all civil power; and they only limit their pretensions to forming an independent state in the state, when circumstances will not allow them to domineer over the state.

Such is at present the condition of the clergy of France, all the members of which are besides disaffected to the government established by a revolution made against them, much more than against a dynasty; and are longing for another restoration from which they anticipate the return of the glorious days of Charles X.* All the efforts made by the citizen king and

* During an excursion recently made in the northern departments of France, we had abundant proofs of the existence of such feelings. There is not a curate who has not the portrait and autograph of Henry V. in his room.

his successive ministries, to conciliate them, have been unavailing, and the government, in its own defence it must be admitted, though not for the good of the people, was compelled to adopt measures for controlling and counteracting the increasing and threatening influence of its inveterate enemies. The principal of these measures relates to the education of the young men preparing for the church, and its object is to place all diocesan religious schools (*petits séminaires*), like all the other schools in the country, under the controul of the royal university. Villemain, as minister for public instruction, prepared and proposed a law for that purpose, which was readily assented to by the subservient Chamber of Peers, but which occasioned such a burst of indignation, on the part of the bishops and the clergy, and led to such violent controversy, that its discussion in the House of Deputies was adjourned from the last to the present session.

Previous to the opening of the Chambers, Villemain had to consult with the king about the introduction of the law into the House of Deputies. The minister, after his warfare with the bishops, considering his honour as at stake, and relying upon the king's obstinacy in his own plans, was determined to press the adoption of the measure, in the lower house, without any concession to the clerical body. Contrary to his expectations, he found the king in a different disposition, and a warm discussion ensued. The irascibility to which his majesty always was subject has, of late years, increased to such a point, that the least contradiction puts him into a passion, and, in this state, he does not minutely weigh the expressions he makes use of, unless it be to render them still more haughty and provoking. After all, this may be proper treatment for the members of his present cabinet, and especially for the one in question, who, in April, 1814, on the place Vendôme, publicly seized the stirrups and kissed the boots of the Emperor Alexander, proclaiming him at the same time the saviour of the country!

We are bound, however, to admit that the king must have carried his practice to a great extremity, since a man of the temper of Villemain, a character stamped with thirty-three years subserviency under every successive government, could not help resenting the insult, and rejoining in terms so ill-sounding to the royal ears, that the master interrupted him in these terms: '*Allons donc! vous êtes fou.*'

Most of our readers are aware that the legitimate kings of France had the gift of curing the scurvy, by merely touching the sufferer, and saying: '*Le Roi te touche; Dieu te guérisse!*' The king of the Barricades, it appears, has another but more awful gift; for, no sooner had the words escaped from his mouth,

than madness had seized the minister, who, losing sight of the king, and imagining that he was '*tête à tête*' with a Jesuit, rushed upon him, seized him by the neckcloth, and was doing his best to strangle him, when, at the cries of the king, officers of his household entered and liberated him from the grasp of the madman, who, cleverly enough for a person in his situation, escaped from the palace, ran to the lunatic asylum where his wife is confined, and being led to her apartment by the doctor, fell into her arms, and said that the Jesuits had ruined him; that he had just had a personal encounter with the very worst of them, whom, had it not been for his assistants, he would have annihilated; but he was overpowered. 'What will become of you, my poor wife? what will become of our children? Jesuits never forgive! we are all undone!' &c. &c.

The doctor, a clever man, immediately saw that, instead of one patient he was likely to have two, and hesitated if he should not immediately order a private room and a strait waistcoat: but, the thought that the huge, unclean, and unintelligent mass in human form he had before him, was a minister, a '*Grand Maître*,' stopped him, and he ordered two servants to take a hackney coach, and see the madman home to his ministerial residence, which orders were instantly and respectfully obeyed. Immediately after the doctor repaired to the palace, and reported the scene which he had witnessed.

The news of such an event spread all over Paris, and its propagation soon alarmed the Thuilleries more than the event itself, and all the ministers were speedily assembled at the palace, to consider what was to be done under such circumstances. The king, already informed of all the particulars that had been circulated, in the first moments of general emotion, thought it best, in his vaunted clemency, to forget every thing except the averred madness of Villemain, and condescended to order those of his household who had witnessed the facts, to lose all recollection of them, and be silent until the official account was regularly and formally issued. There being no doubt about the lunacy of the absent colleague, a family predisposition to it was easily established. One of his youngest brothers, a scholar of the imperial Lycée, (now college Louis le Grand), hung himself in a cell where he had been placed under arrest. Another, afterwards an officer of artillery, committed so many acts of folly, that, in 1823, he was sent to the colonies, through the influence of his brother, then a legitimist, to get rid of him. Furthermore, incipient insanity, so far back as 1827, was proved against Villemain himself, by the publication of a romance, entitled, *LASCARIS*: therefore it was agreed that the fact of the lunacy should be officially admitted, with suitable expressions of regret

at the loss of the invaluable services of such a man, and of hope that his recovery would soon enable him to render new services to the state. Nay more, the better to secure and hasten the complete cure of the unfortunate *Grand Maître*, the king resolved to grant him a pension of fifteen thousand francs a year, and, with his customary liberality, ordered the council to prepare and propose a law for making this pension payable by the people.

But a most important point remained unsettled; that is to say, the immediate cause, and the circumstances which attended the outburst of madness. The witnesses of the facts, in the first impulse of wonder and indignation, had been so indiscreet as to give all the particulars, which had soon spread over Paris, on such authority, and with such effect, that an official denial was considered as likely to be unsuccessful, and even to be more injurious than the report itself. Thanks to the wisdom evinced by the king, in ordering his attendants to forget all that occurred in their presence, as he himself had resolved to do, though they were not required to be silent, the constitutional government was extricated from this embarrassing situation. On the day after the event, twenty different and contradictory versions were so industriously circulated, that even the best knowing began to doubt, not merely the accuracy of the reports, but also the truth of the fact itself, of Villemain being mad. This disposition of the public was another difficulty for the ministers, particularly at the opening of the legislative session; but fortunately, Villemain came to their assistance, and set the matter at rest, by jumping out of a window, without in the least injuring himself, in an attempt to escape from his ministerial residence, where, he declared, that Jesuits were threatening to poison or murder him.

This last act of decided lunacy was at once made known everywhere; and as it established that the predominant, if not the only character of the mental disease, was hatred and fear of Jesuits, every one naturally was anxious to ascertain what could have occasioned that hatred and fear, on the part of a minister of state, who had at his disposal the police, the gendarmes, the king's attorneys, the general attorneys, the judges and the juries of the land. This anxiety was soon relieved; and the good people of Paris, and of the rest of France, were gravely and *almost officially* told, that the reading of the 'Wandering Jew' had done all the mischief. The moment this wonderful piece of news was promulgated, all the previous reports and rumours were obliterated from the public mind. Villemain himself would have been completely lost sight of, were it not that his madness was connected with the all-absorbing subject, 'Le Juif Errant.' Nothing else was spoken of. 'Have you read the

'Juif Errant,' which disorganized the mind of our Grand Maître?' 'You must read the 'Juif Errant,'—'all must read the 'Juif Errant,'—for a while supplanted the customary greeting of every one, on meeting with an acquaintance: Good morning—how do you do? Such being the case among our neighbours, it is clear that we could not avoid remarking on the 'Juif Errant' to the readers of the '*Eclectic*.'

If our limits allowed us so to do, we should here claim attention to some new political questions arising from the facts admitted in Paris, and which, for aught we know, may soon occur here also, and endanger, if not the person of her most gracious Majesty, at least, the existence of her government. We must content ourselves with merely propounding them, in the hope that they may be taken up by some of our political philosophers, in want of a subject; nay, even by the author of '*Coningsby*,' so well qualified to elucidate the following points:

1st. The superiority of romances, novels, and tales over history, in exhibiting the events and characters of our times.

2nd. Romances, novels, and tales, considered as a medium of government.

3rd. Romances, novels, and tales, considered as engines of opposition and of ministerial revolutions.

4th, and last, The superior fitness of romance and novel writers for the government of our own or any other country, on the now generally-admitted principle of expediency; that is to say, of finding out expedients in any given circumstances.

There is no inconsistency between this last proposition, and the fact stated in a preceding page, of incipient insanity being proved against Villemain, by his writing and publishing '*Lascaris*;' for, notwithstanding the title and the matter of the book, and the evident intention of rivaling the travels of Anacharsis, by Barthelemy, and the journey of Anténor in Greece, by Lantier, the few persons who ever read the book, could never range it under any category, except that of '*Livres ennuyeux*;' while the publisher, Ladvocat, placed it on the pile of '*unsaleable books*,' where almost the whole edition was found by the assignees of his bankruptcy, two or three years afterwards; and sold as waste paper, with half the edition of the *Life of Cromwell*, by the same author.

Villemain himself, conscious of his failure, admitted that he was a bad hand at novel writing; and, not only never thought of again attempting it, but even began to feel and to express contempt and aversion for that special kind of literature; so much so, that, being asked one day by a lady, his opinion of *Notre Dame de Paris*, he answered, '*Je ne lis pas ces ordures*!' (I do not read those dirty books.) How, then, did it occur that

the despiser of Victor Hugo should have made an exception in favour of Eugene Sue, and should have read the 'Juif Errant,' after his unqualified reprobation of 'Notre Dame'? This must be explained.

Our readers are not aware of the discredit into which the daily press of Paris has fallen. The inconsistency, the party prejudices, the unblushing corruption of all the newspapers, their neglect of general interests for coterie quarrels, have so disgusted the public, that very few care about them, except for the scanty news which they occasionally contain. A glance at this part of the paper is all they condescend to give; and as they can see all the newspapers for nothing at the coffee-houses, or for one penny, at the 'cabinets de lecture,' (reading-rooms,) established in almost every street in Paris, very few persons regularly take in a paper, as annual or even quarterly subscribers, except coffee-house or reading-room keepers. The consequence naturally has been a considerable decrease in the circulation of all the newspapers, an idea of which may be formed from the fact, that the twenty-eight thousand annual subscribers to the 'Constitutionnel,' in 1829, had dropped down to three thousand, a few years ago; * whilst, at the same time, the circulation of other newspapers did not increase.

All the efforts of newspaper proprietors to raise the general circulation of their journals, literary critiques, verses, police and law reports, and even a considerable reduction in price, were of no avail. At last, one of the proprietors imagined that tales and novels might be more acceptable than his politics; that, if gentlemen were disinclined to waste their time on such reading, ladies would probably be less fastidious; and that, as they could not, without impropriety, frequent the coffee-houses or reading-rooms, to gratify their desire for startling emotions, they would induce their husbands or their parents to take an *abonnement* to the paper. This plan succeeded well enough with one (we think) *la Presse*, to induce other newspaper proprietors to follow the example; and, finally, the old 'Constitutionnel' itself adopted the same course; taking care, in the meanwhile, to announce that the services of M. Eugene Sue had been engaged, at the price of one hundred thousand francs for a novel which he was then writing, and which would regularly appear in the *Feuilleton*. On the faith of this report, and judging of the value of the work, by the enormous sum said to have been paid for it, every reader of romances subscribed to the 'Consti-

* In 1828, Lafitte bought one of the fifteen shares of the 'Constitutionnel,' for Messrs. Cauchois-Lemaire, and Thiers, for which he paid 100,000 francs, (£4000,) and three years ago the whole paper was bought for £5000 sterling, by Veron, a compeer of Thiers.

tutionel,' whose circulation was increased, it is said, by nine or ten thousand copies a day.

Thus it is that the 'Wandering Jew' was introduced to the Grand Maître, who, as well as all the other ministers, subscribed to all the newspapers; sometimes condescending to look at them. After the quasi-official announcement that Villemain used to read, with deep interest, all the numbers of the Constitutionnel which contained a portion of the new novel, we know French ministerial veracity too well to express a doubt with regard to the truth of the statement, and, therefore, our readers will, if they please, take for granted that the minister studiously perused the work, and that the work upset the understanding of the minister. We should think that many other brains have been similarly affected, by the same cause, and perhaps all the cases will soon be publicly reported, to add to the triumph of the author, and to the circulation of the Constitutionnel.

Eugene Sue is one of the most prolific of French novel writers. 'The Female Bluebeard,' 'the Godolphin Arab,' 'Mathilde,' 'the Mysteries of Paris,' and, we believe, three or four other works of the same sort, in three, four, or five volumes each, had prepared the public for the present performance, which reproduces, in their worst features, the extravagance, the licentiousness, the ignorance, the absurdity, and the horrors of the thirty or forty preceding volumes, from the same pen, and of twenty times as many volumes from other purveyors for the depraved appetites of French readers, who, we regret to say, are principally women of the upper classes, and milliners, known as *grisettes*.

We cannot describe the plan of the author, for now-a-days, particularly in France, authors dispense with plans. 'Plans have lasted their time.' (*Les plans ont fait leur temps*), as the high priest of the Doctrine says of all the moral, political and religious principles, which are incompatible with doctrinarian science. Plans are obsolete, ridiculous, *rococo*. Without plan, one is free to write what he pleases, and as he pleases. Imagination may run wild, instead of being shut up in the narrow limits of order and taste, of the *methodus ordo*. For the same reason there is not merely a plot, there are as many plots as may be suggested to the author, in the course of his performance, by any new object, fact, or impression which may affect his mind. Thus every thing can be made available for the purpose of diversity. The whole world, and every part of it successively, may be made the theatre of one scene, and all without connection or dependence. Coherence would be a damning defect in modern works of fiction. Modern genius, in one word, con-

sists in making, if we can use the expression, literary kaleidoscopes, in which epochs, events, countries, institutions, manners, and personages are so congregated, confused, distorted and wheeled round, that nobody can say of what he sees, either what it is, or what it is not. Such is preeminently the character of the 'Wandering Jew.'

The real beginning of the work takes place in the third volume, chap. lxxviii. and lxxvii. In 1682, a certain Marius de Rennepont, a French nobleman, one of the most active and determined leaders of the reformed religion, pretended to abjure protestantism, in order to preserve his immense property, and so leave it to his only son, then a young man of eighteen years of age, who however remained faithful to his creed, and 'died a victim to a mysterious crime.' The father could no longer submit to a deception repugnant to his religious feelings; he was watched, accused, and condemned as a relapsed heretic; he was sentenced to the galleys. Rather than submit to this degradation, slavery and wretchedness, he resolved to put an end to his own existence, and, before accomplishing his design, made his will. A sum of fifty thousand crowns, which he had entrusted to a friend, was all that remained of his fortune. These fifty thousand crowns, divided amongst his relatives, then exiled and dispersed throughout Europe, in consequence of the revocation of the edict of Nantes, would have been very little for each, he therefore determined to dispose of his property in a different way. The man to whom the money had been entrusted, Isaac Samuel, and after him his descendants, were requested to undertake the management of this sum, and of the capitalised interest, until the expiration of the one hundred and fiftieth year, commencing from the day of the nobleman's death. At that period, that is to say, on the 13th of February, 1832, before noon, the existing members of his family were to appear in person at a certain house, Rue St. Francis, to witness the opening of the will; and those who should be present were to share equally in the accumulated treasure.

The object of M. de Rennepont, whose family had been so cruelly persecuted by the Jesuits, is explained in the will in the following terms: 'If an evil association, based on human degradation, fear, and despotism, and followed by the curses of mankind, has survived for ages, and frequently governed the world by fraud and terror, what might not be expected from one proceeding on brotherly affection, or evangelical love, and having no other end than to free both man and woman from every degrading bondage; administering here below to the

happiness of those who have never known aught but grief and misery : ennobling and enriching wholesome labour ; enlightening those who are in the darkness of ignorance ; promoting the free expansion of all those feelings which God, in his infinite wisdom, in his inexhaustible bounty has bestowed on man, as so many powerful levers, to sanctify all that emanates from the Almighty,—love as well as maternal solicitude,—power as well as knowledge,—beauty as well as wisdom ;—rendering, in short, all men truly pious and profoundly grateful to their Creator, for giving them a knowledge of the splendours of nature, and their merited share of the treasures which he has showered down upon us ? Oh ! that it would please heaven, in a century and a half, that the descendants of my family, faithful to the last wishes of one who is a friend to humanity, may thus be gathered together in one holy community ! If Heaven grants that among those who may then meet, there be charitable spirits overflowing with pity for those who are suffering—generous souls who are friendly to freedom—warm and eloquent hearts—firm characters—women uniting wisdom and freedom with beauty—how fruitful and powerful would be the harmonious junction of all these ideas, of all these influences, of all these powers, of all these attractions, grouped around this regal fortune, which, concentrated by union and wisely governed, might render practicable the most utopian schemes ! What a wonderful concentration of generous and fertile thoughts ; what salutary and vivifying rays would constantly go forth from such a centre of charity, of freedom, and of love ! What grand things might be attempted ; what magnificent ——— ;’ but we must stop, though we have hardly arrived at the middle of the paragraph, which is followed by many others equally magniloquent.

In this literal translation our object is to give, as much as is in our power, an accurate idea of the mind of Eugène Sue, and of his style ; we confess that we are much beneath our original ; perhaps the British language does not lend itself to the reproduction of the beauties of French romanticism.

In 1832, the capital and accumulated interests of the fifty thousand crowns, according to the accounts regularly kept, balanced and given by M. Sue, in the seventy-second chapter, entitled, Debit and Credit, amounted to two hundred and twelve millions one hundred and seventy-five thousand francs. The grandson of the first depositor, now an old man of eighty-two, had for above fifty years continued and extended the operations begun by his father and grandfather, while at the same time he fulfilled the humble functions of *concièrge* of the old house in St. Francis-street, where all the documents and the will were

deposited. Samuel, the good old man, and his wife Bathsheba, anxiously awaited the coming of the 13th of February, and of the legitimate claimants to the property, who were dispersed all over the world.

But the Jesuits, who are everywhere, and know everything, not only had discovered that an enormous amount of property was on the point of being divided among the descendants of the relatives of their victims, but also had resolved to become possessors of it. They were acquainted with all the particulars of the will of M. Marius de Rennepont; nay, even more, they had traced out all the parties having a claim to the property, notwithstanding the long time that had elapsed, and the perigrinations and vicissitudes they had been subjected to. Thus we find (chap. xvi) the superior agent of the Jesuits in Paris, receiving the following communication:—

‘A hundred and fifty years ago, a French protestant family, foreseeing the speedy revocation of the edict of Nantes, went into voluntary exile, in order to avoid the rigorous and just decrees already issued against the members of the reformed church, those indomitable foes of our holy religion.

‘Some members of this family sought refuge in Holland, and afterwards in the Dutch colonies; others in Poland and Germany; some in England, and some in America. It is supposed that only seven descendants remain of this family, who have undergone strange vicissitudes. Its present representatives are found in all ranks of society, from the sovereign to the mechanic. These descendants, direct or indirect, are: on the mother’s side:

‘Rose and Blanch Simon; under age. (General Simon married at Warsaw a descendant of the said family.)

‘M. Francis Hardy, manufacturer at Plessis, near Paris.

‘Prince Djalma, son of Kadja Sing, King of Mondî. (Kadja Sing married, in 1802, a descendant of the aforesaid family, then settled at Batavia, in the island of Java, a Dutch colony.

‘On the father’s side:

‘James Rennepont, mechanic.

‘Adrienne de Cardoville, daughter of Count Rennepont, Duke of Cardoville.

‘Gabriel Rennepont, priest of the foreign missions.

‘All the members of the family possess, or should possess, a bronze medal, bearing the following inscriptions:

‘On one side:

‘Victim
of
L. C. D. I.
Pray for me.
Paris,
13th February, 1682.’

‘ On the other side :

‘ At Paris,
No. 3, Francis street,
In a century and a half,
You must be.
The 13th February, 1832.
Pray for me.’

‘ These words and dates show that all of them have a great interest to be in Paris on the 13th of February, 1832, and not by proxy, but in person, whether they be of age or minors, married or single ; but other persons have an equal interest that none of the descendants of the family be at Paris on that day, except Gabriel Rennepont, priest of the foreign missions. At all hazards, therefore, Gabriel must be the only person present at the rendezvous appointed to the descendants of the family, a century and a half ago. To prevent the six other persons from reaching Paris on that day, or to render their presence of no effect, much has been already done ; but much more remains to be done to ensure the success of the affair, which is considered as the most vital and most important of the age, on account of its probable results.’

Our readers will conceive the importance of Gabriel being the only one of the claimants present at the appointed place, on the 13th of February, when they are apprised that the young priest has been admitted into the society of Jesuits ; and that, according to the rules of the Order, no member of the society can possess any private fortune ; and that any property which may, by succession or otherwise, accrue to him, immediately becomes the property of the Order.

Much had been done, as we see in the novel, to prevent all the other claimants from being in Paris, to dispute with the reverend fathers their respective shares in the accumulated capital. At the time when the communication above quoted was received by the director-general (at the beginning of October), Rose and Blanche Simon were with their mother, captives in Siberia. Prince Djalma was either fighting against the ‘cruel’ English, to defend the kingdom of his father, with the assistance of General Simon ; or, defeated, a fugitive, or prisoner. Gabriel himself was in America, and had been ordered home. James Rennepont, the mechanic, was ignorant of his claims ; and Mr. Hardy, the manufacturer, as well as Mademoiselle Adrienne de Cardoville, were supposed to know no more of theirs. So that, in all probability, the treasures would soon pass into the Jesuits’ coffers.

The covetous fathers, however, were doomed to disappointment. Some days before the 13th of February two ships—one

coming from America, the other from Hamburgh—assailed by a tremendous storm, were thrown on the rocky shores of Picardy, completely wrecked. Most of the passengers were drowned, some few only being saved, and hospitably received by the bailiff of the castle of Cardoville. Among these few, however, were Rose and Blanche Simon, Gabriel, and Prince Djalma; with an old horse-grenadier of the Imperial Guard, and a Malay ruffian who accompanied the prince, to betray or serve him, as might best suit his momentary interests. All of them were in Paris on the 11th or 12th of February, ready to appear on the 13th at the appointed place; whilst, on the other side, Mademoiselle Adrienne de Cardoville let some few words escape which indicated a certain knowledge of the mysterious secret: so that years of Jesuitical toil to obtain the golden prize were completely lost.

In these unfavorable circumstances, the reverend fathers were not discouraged; on the contrary, they resolved to resort to extreme measures in order that their own claimant should alone be present at the rendezvous. On the fatal 13th of February, Rose and Blanche Simon had been carried away from the lodgings of their humble protector, and shut up in a convent. Mademoiselle Adrienne de Cardoville was confined in a mad-house, where she had been driven in the carriage of her medical doctor, under pretence of conducting her to the residence of the minister. James Rennepont, the mechanic, had been arrested in the middle of a most disgusting orgie, and led to the debtor's prison. Mr. Hardy, the manufacturer, had been sent to Lyons, by a forged letter of a friend in that city, claiming his assistance; and Prince Djalma, having drunk a draught given to him by his Malay attendant, was kept in a profound sleep in his apartment at the hotel.

Having disposed, in this summary way, of all the claimants except their own, the Jesuits were masters of the field; and, on the 13th of February, before noon, the provincial, Father d'Aigrigny, with his secretary, Rodin, were at the house Rue St. Francis, with the Abbé Gabriel, to assist at the opening of the walled up mansion, to hear the reading of the will, to pass the accounts of old Samuel, in presence of a notary, and to take possession of all the property. Every thing went on as they could wish; and all the formalities having been fulfilled, a clock placed in an adjoining room to that in which they were, though it had not been wound up for one century and a half, began striking twelve. No sooner was the last stroke heard, than the secretary, Rodin, exclaimed 'Twelve o'clock!' and the notary said, 'No other descendant of M. Marius de Rennepont having presented himself before noon, I proceed to execute the will of the testator, and declare, in the name of justice and the law, M. Francis

Marie Gabriel de Rennepont, here present, the sole and only heir and possessor of the estates, personal and real property, and valuables of whatever kind arising from the succession of the testator,—which property the said Gabriel de Rennepont, priest, has freely, and on his own accord, given by notorial act, to Frederic Emanuel de Bordeville, Marquis d'Aigrigny, priest, who, by the same deed, has accepted it, and thereby becomes the legitimate possessor, in the room and place of the aforesaid Gabriel de Rennepont, by a deed of gift between living persons, which has been, this morning, engrossed by me, and signed, Gabriel de Rennepont, and Frederic d'Aigrigny, priests.' The notary, then, after having ascertained the amount of the property, which was deposited in a cedar casket, said to Father d'Aigrigny, 'Sir, take possession of this casket.'

Thus far the success of the Jesuits was complete, and both Father d'Aigrigny and Rodin, the secretary, were exulting in their triumph; but when just on the point of departing, the latter holding under his arm the cedar casket, containing the property—at that very moment, the door of the room wherein the clock was heard to strike, was suddenly thrown open, and a woman appeared upon the threshold. After pausing some little time, without speaking a word, she advanced slowly, approached one of the pieces of antique furniture, touched a secret spring and opened the top drawer, from which she took a parcel of sealed parchment, and approaching the table, she placed the parcel before the notary, who took it up mechanically, having till that moment been both mute and motionless. After having bestowed on Gabriel, who seemed fascinated by her presence, a look of melancholy sweetness, she directed her steps towards the door of the vestibule. In passing old Samuel and Bathsheba, who had fallen on their knees, she stopped a moment, and bending her beautiful head towards the elderly couple, she contemplated them with tender solicitude, and after having given them her hand to kiss, she retreated as slowly as she had entered, but not without casting a parting look on Gabriel.'

Of course all the witnesses of this extraordinary apparition of a woman, in a house uninhabited and walled up for a hundred and fifty years, had been thrown into a sort of stupefaction. D'Aigrigny and Rodin, however, soon sufficiently recovered their self possession, to seize the opportunity which the amazement of all the parties present offered, of making a hasty retreat with their treasure, without waiting for the opening of the parcel delivered by the mysterious lady, which had begun to excite their apprehension. Their exit, however, was observed and prevented by old Samuel, who insisted upon their remaining in the room, until the notary had examined the parchment which had just been put into his hands. The notary being of the same

opinion with the faithful trustee, Father d'Aigrigny and the secretary were obliged to comply with the request. The parcel was opened in their presence, and the notary read the following codicil:—

'This is a codicil, which, for reasons which will be explained in the papers under this cover, adjourn and prorogue to the 1st of June 1832, but without altering in any other respect, the disposition contained in the will made by me this day, at one o'clock in the afternoon. The house must be shut up and walled up again, and the property must remain in charge of the person who may, at that time, be in possession of it, to be, on the 1st of June, distributed to those who are entitled to it. Villetaneuse, the 13th February, 1682, eleven o'clock at night. Marius de Rennepont.'

In conformity with the dispositions of this codicil, the notary, in spite of the protests of the two Jesuits, postponed for three months and a-half the liquidation of the succession, and all the parties left the house. Father d'Aigrigny, with his assistant, repaired to the residence of the Princess St. Dizier, a leader of the female Jesuits in Paris, to report their misadventure. D'Aigrigny, in a state of hopeless despondency, after relating all the particulars of this eventful morning, to the princess, thought it necessary to write, without delay, to the General of the Jesuits at Rome. He ordered his secretary to take his seat at the table, and to write what he was going to dictate. Rodin obeyed, and the reverend Father began in these terms:

'All our hopes, recently amounting to almost a certainty, have been blasted. The Rennepont affair, notwithstanding all the care and ability with which it had hitherto been managed, has completely failed, and without a chance of recovery. As matters are at present, it has unfortunately been worse than unsuccessful. It is a most disastrous circumstance for the society, to whom this wealth morally belonged, by the confiscation decreed in its favour, and from which it was fraudulently withheld. I have, however, the satisfaction of having done every thing up to the latest moment, to defend and secure our rights. But, I repeat, we must consider this important affair as absolutely and for ever at an end, and give no further thought to it.'

These last words were hardly spoken when the secretary rose from his chair, and throwing his pen upon the table, refused to continue writing such a letter, notwithstanding the repeated commands of the reverend father, and the entreaties of the princess. Rodin, the hitherto humble and submissive secretary, on a sudden assumed such an air of superiority that though he did not speak a word, d'Aigrigny and the princess felt unaccountably subdued. The fact is that, this subordinate agent had been given

to him, to act as a spy as much and more than as an auxiliary, with power and authority, in certain urgent cases, and according to the constitution of the Order, of superseding and replacing him. D'Aigrigny began to suspect this, and said to Rodin: 'No doubt you have a right to command me, as I have hitherto commanded you?' Rodin, without answering, drew from his pocket-book a slip of paper which he presented to his ex-master, who, having read it, returned it with a profound obeisance. The first use that Rodin made of his authority, was to order d'Aigrigny to take the seat which he himself had just left; and to write the following letter to the General of the Jesuits.

'From want of tact, in reverend father d'Aigrigny, the affair of Rennepont has been to-day placed in great jeopardy. The property amounts to two hundred and twelve millions of francs. Notwithstanding this check, we think that we may yet be enabled, not only to prevent the Rennepont family from wronging the society, but also to compel that family to restore to the society the two hundred and twelve millions which legitimately belong to us. To effect this we must immediately be provided with the most ample and complete powers.'

Such is the outline of M. Eugene Sue's novel, the continuation of which, in the *Constitutionnel*, has been discontinued for a time, since the opening of the legislative session; the eloquence of liberal members, in behalf of M. Thiers's policy, claiming the space hitherto reserved to the chapters of the Novelist. But, in all probability, the fair subscribers will soon be dissatisfied with the substitute, and our author will resume his work, and add as many chapters as have already been printed.

As to the incidents, which, mixing one with another, or crossing one another, produce a most ludicrous confusion, they are all brought about by the influence of the Jesuits, in order to prevent the members of the Rennepont family from being present, to sustain their claim to the succession of Marius de Rennepont, at the time fixed for the division of the property. We therefore have, in succession, all the adventures of all the members of the family, detailed with all the minuteness and proximity which characterize penny-liners, without their regard for accuracy or probability.

The first personages introduced are Rose and Blanche Simon. No romance, in France, is acceptable, unless the soldiers of the empire are introduced, and play a principal part. General Simon was, according to our author, one of the bravest followers of Napoleon; and for the courage and military skill he displayed in the combat which preceded the battle of Waterloo, he had been made a field-marshal and Duke of Ligny. After the second restoration of the Bourbons, who refused to confirm his titles,

General Simon left the service, and repaired to Poland, where he married. But, being soon after implicated in a conspiracy, the object of which was the liberation of Poland from the Russian tyranny, the general was ordered out of the country, in which he left his wife, advanced in her pregnancy. The Jesuits, who were already aware of the claims of the lady to a share in the succession of Rennepont, contrived to have her exiled to Siberia, where she gave birth to the twin-sisters, and died towards the end of 1830, leaving them under the protection of an old mounted grenadier of the imperial guard, who, at the demand of his general, had sworn never to desert his wife, and was faithful to his oath. After the death of Madame Simon, the old soldier, who had been made acquainted with the rights of the young girls, and who knew how important it was for them to be in Paris on the 13th of February, immediately set off with the orphans, and, with the assistance of an old horse, also of the imperial guard (a clever addition to the requisite imperialism), he succeeded in reaching Leipsic, where we find them all in the third chapter.

The Jesuits who, by a singular oversight, had not prevented their departure from Siberia, hastened to take proper measures to arrest their progress; and, for this purpose, had sent to Leipsic one of their agents, a wild beast tamer, like Carter or Van Amburg, to whom proper directions were given. This man, Morock, an Indian savage, converted by the Jesuits, was at the Falcon Inn, with his assistants, and a tiger, a lion, and a panther, respectively named Cain, Judas, and Death, when the old soldier, Dagobert, arrived. The plans of the beast tamer to hinder the wanderers from pursuing their journey were carried into execution, in the same night. The old horse was taken from its stable, and brought to the panther, who having been deprived of her supper, soon devoured the poor animal; the passports of Dagobert were stolen from his bag; and he was arrested, and led to a prison, where we lose sight of him, as well as of his interesting wards, until we find them, with him, on board the ship from Hamburg, wrecked on the rocks of the coast of Picardy:—rocks created for the purpose, by the author, who takes the greatest liberties with geography and topography, as well as with contemporary history.

As we have before stated, the two sisters who had been brought to Paris by Dagobert, and placed under the care of his wife, a simple and bigotted woman, were carried away and secluded in a convent. The place of their confinement was, however, soon discovered, thanks to the fidelity and sagacity of Dagobert's Siberian dog, who, after strangling the dog of the lady who had taken the young girls from M. Dagobert, had

followed the carriage, and afterwards had conducted his master to the convent. The old soldier resolved to storm the convent that very night, and to rescue the daughters of Marshal Simon. The author gives a long account of this midnight expedition, but interrupts his narration in the middle, without any cause, only leaving us reason to think that the attempt was unsuccessful.

Then follows the history of General Simon, after his expulsion from Poland. Hatred of the English, is also, as it appears, a requisite in novels, as well as in parliamentary harangues, and in the leading articles of the newspapers. General Simon labours under an incurable Anglophobia, ever since the battle of Waterloo; and, in order to take his revenge, he repairs to India, and offers his services to the king of Mondi (a kingdom of the creation of M. Eugene Sue), against the British invaders. Of course, his services are accepted, and the general has the gratification of exhibiting his courage and military genius, on many occasions. We have room only for the beginning of one of his bulletins addressed to his wife:—‘I have already mentioned the two good days we have had this month. The troops of my old friend, the Indian prince, under European discipline, have effected wonders. We routed the English, and they were obliged to abandon a part of the unfortunate country invaded by them, without law and justice, which they continue to ravage without pity, *for this is English warfare.*’ A few days after this success, however, the English, in their turn, routed the army, so well disciplined; the old king was made a prisoner, and deprived of his crown. His son, Djalma, and the general, both badly wounded, succeeded, however, in making their escape, and in reaching Batavia.

Djalma, as we have already seen, was one of the Rennepont family, and the Jesuits determined to prevent his being present in Paris, had beforehand commissioned their agents in the Dutch colony, to get rid of this obnoxious claimant. They found no other means than to apply to some Thugs (stranglers), who had taken refuge in the island, and whose operations are related at length. One of them succeeded in tattooing on the arm of the young prince, while he was in a profound sleep, the signs, which, according to our author, distinguish the Indian murderers. He afterwards enticed him into a cave, where three or four of them had fixed their residence, and where he was arrested with them, and, as evidently one of them, by orders from the governor, and put into a dungeon, where our author leaves him, until, on a sudden, we find him on board the second ship, the Black Eagle, wrecked on the coast of Picardy, which ship ‘sailing from Alexandria to Portsmouth, through the straits of Gibralter, had touched the Azores!’

Gabriel, the young priest, was on board the same vessel, on his return from America. His doings in the new world are not related in the novel. The only thing we find concerning his career as a missionary, is, that some of the savages he endeavoured to convert to Christianity, had crucified him. How his life was preserved, we have no means of ascertaining; but he not only was saved, but also, in the shipwreck on the coast of France, succeeded in saving Blanche and Rose from a watery grave. This young priest, though the Jesuits had discovered his lineage, was a sort of foundling, whom the wife of the old soldier Dagobert, although very poor, and having a son of her own, had reared up from his infancy, until her confessor placed him in a clerical school, to make a priest of him, in spite of himself, and a Jesuit beside. In the last chapters of the published part of the work, Gabriel, disgusted with the doings of his superiors, and convinced of their treachery, determines to leave the society; and, in order to obtain his release from the obligations of his vows, transfers on the provincial, d'Aigrigny, all his rights to the property of Rennepont, without knowing its amount; which inconsiderate bargain he, of course, deeply regrets, when he hears from Dagobert, and his adoptive mother, that, by it, he had deprived Rose and Blanche, and some other claimants, of their legitimate share in the property.

Mademoiselle Adrienne de Rennepont de Cardoville's history is, in some sort, the most curious of all. This young lady, of an eccentric and fanciful character, is the realization of the *femme libre* of the St. Simonists. Endowed with a supreme contempt for superannuated notions of propriety, and for public opinion, she does what she pleases, and in what manner soever she pleases; taking care, however, to do nothing as any body else. Her dress, her habits, her tastes, are all complacently portrayed; and probably, at this present moment, many musical French ladies of fashion, in imitation of this heroine, *blow the French-horn on a golden instrument*. Adrienne, though not of age, yet having lost both her father and mother, is allowed by her aunt, the Princess of St. Dizier, to live as she likes, and to expend her income as she chooses; so that she might, in the shortest time possible, qualify herself for a residence in a mad-house, or at the least, afford a pretence for inflicting that seclusion upon the thoughtless girl. Her lost lap-dog is found by Agricola, a blacksmith, the son of Dagobert, who, seeing the name of the owner on the collar, takes the spaniel to her mistress. She immediately offers a handsome reward in money, which is unhesitatingly refused with an air of such dignity, that the young lady, begging his pardon, presents him with a most beautiful and odoriferous camelia, lying upon the table, promising at the

same time that, in any circumstance, he might apply to her, and rely upon her best services. The very next day Agricola was in need of her good offices. Our blacksmith was at the same time a poet, and composed popular songs. France is not now governed by Mazarin, who used to say of the satiric songs composed against himself: 'It matters little if they sing and laugh, since they pay.' At present the French people pay, they do not laugh; and if they sing, it is at great peril to themselves. Such was the case with Agricola. One of his songs was seized by the police, in the room of another mechanic implicated in some plots against the government, concocted by a secret association. The songster was immediately made an accomplice, and orders to arrest him were issued. Under such circumstances, and aware of the impending danger, Agricola repaired to the hotel of Miss Adrienne, who secreted him in a closet near her apartment, until she could obtain the revocation of the warrant. Unfortunately the blacksmith had been followed by the officers, who discovered his place of retreat, from whence they took him to a prison, while his fair protectress was driven to a private lunatic asylum, by the false friend whom she had requested to accompany her to the residence of a minister, to whom she intended to apply in favour of the mechanic.

In connection with the history of Adrienne, we have that of the Princess of St. Dizier, and of the Marquis-Abbé d'Aigrigny. We cannot pollute our pages with even an outline of the scenes of depravity which are exhibited in this portion of the work, and, for the same reason, we forbear from entering into the particulars of the reckless career of James Rennepont the mechanic, and another claimant to the property. Numerous chapters are devoted to the illustration of the abandoned life of this man, and of his 'queen of the revels,' and we confess that disgust compelled us to turn over many pages.

There is scarcely anything concerning M. Hardy the manufacturer, and the last of the claimants, with the exception of some hints, on the part of the Jesuits, to get him out of their way, on the 13th of February, and to undermine his credit and reduce him to insolvency, by any means in their power, as the only commensurate atonement for the uprightness of his principles and of his conduct, for his patriotism, and his hatred of their society, as much as on account of his being entitled to the property which they coveted.

Around all these personages group many others, too numerous to be mentioned, whose history and doings are equally recorded, so that the principals are generally lost sight of. Such, however, is the poverty of the author's imagination, wild and mad as it is, that the already bulky volumes he has pub-

lished of this novel, would be reduced to a common sized octavo of three hundred pages, if he had not, in the catch-penny fashion, swollen the matter by the description of every one of his personages, of the localities, and of the most insignificant circumstances. Sun risings and sun settings are in abundance. Moonlights and stormy nights occur every two or three chapters, without much variety in their characteristics, however different the climate. Every room, every part of the furniture is described, as well as the posture of the actors in the scenes. When we say described, we do not use the proper word, for the description of the author generally does not resemble anything that has ever been seen. Countries, localities, national manners, history, natural phenomena; in one word, every thing is boldly set at defiance, by the descriptive system of Eugène Sue.

In order to enable our English readers to form an opinion of the merits of Eugène Sue, in this respect, we beg leave to say a few words of another of his novels, in which he describes the manners of England. In his 'Godolphin Arabian' the principal events take place in England. It is no longer the old soldier, with his horse of the imperial guard, and his dog, but a mute Arab, Agba, with his horse Sham, and his cat Grimalkin, (animals always play a great part in Eugène Sue's novels). A rich quaker had picked them all up in some street in Paris, and brought them all home, to his country residence, 'Buryhall, on the banks of the Thames,' for the only purpose of making them comfortable and happy. The good-natured quaker was baffled in his designs, by the obstinacy of the horse, which would allow nobody to ride him, except his master and friend, Agba. The quaker tried, and was thrown; which misdemeanor on the part of the animal he generously overlooked. All his servants were treated in the same manner, and did not shew the same forgiving disposition, but they dared not manifest their resentment too openly. Unfortunately, *a reverend clergyman, Dr. Harrison, who had married the only daughter of the kind-hearted quaker!!*—and who was proud of his own equestrian abilities, attempted to ride the insubordinate beast, and with no better success than his predecessors. The quaker could no longer bear with the restive spirit of the arabian stallion, and summoned Agba before a sort of court martial, composed of himself, his daughter, Dr. Harrison, and his friend *the landlord of the Crowned Lion, the principal public-house of the village.* The sentence passed unanimously was, that 'Sham should be sold;' and it was carried into execution. As the companionship of Agba with his horse was considered the principal cause of the stubbornness of the animal, it was determined that they should be parted, and the horse was taken to London, where every means were employed to tame it.

But Agba, who could not live happy without his friend, went to town to see it, and being constantly refused admittance, resolved to escalate the house and the stables, during the night, just as Dagobert, in the 'Wandering Jew,' escalated the convent to rescue Rose and Blanche, but with no better success. Nay, even more, his failure was attended with worse consequences; for he was taken as a burglar, and sent to Newgate, where, two or three days after his imprisonment, in a fit of despair, he was going to hang himself, when he was providentially saved by the visit paid at the prison by Lady Sarah Jennings, the widow of the great Duke of Marlborough, attended by her eldest son, Lord Godolphin!! The doings of the lady, and the gross language of her son, are in keeping with the strange notions just exhibited of the English manners, and of our aristocratic families. Is it with the same knowledge and the same accuracy that our author describes, in the 'Wandering Jew,' the habits and manners of the several countries to which he chooses to transport his personages.

On reaching the end of the published part of this equally disgusting and absurd publication, we entertained some hope that the author had exhausted his store of filthy reminiscences, and that the continuation of the work would be comparatively free from the demoralising pictures which fill the first part; but we were soon disappointed. Eugene Sue takes great care to stimulate the depraved appetite of his readers, by promising something still more abominable than that on which he had hitherto fed them. All the events related in the first part were the produce of the combinations of the profligate Marquess Abbé d'Aigrigny, and as they had not succeeded in obtaining the desired results, his successor in the management of the plot, Rodin, convinced that the failure is owing only to the scruples of his late unprincipled master, reproaches him for his want of skill and détermination, and expounds his own plans in the following terms:

'You have had recourse to rough and physical measures, instead of acting upon noble, generous, and elevated feelings, which, when united, offer an invincible phalanx; but divided, may successively be overcome by surprise, seduction, artifice, or by any other common mode of attack. Now do you understand me? . . . Did any one ever die from despair? Will not gratitude and happy love lead to the very limits of insane generosity? Are there not some deceptions so horrible, that suicide is the only refuge against these dreadful realities? May not an excess of sensuality lead to the tomb, by a slow and voluptuous agony? Are there, in human life, some circumstances so terrible, as to bring the most worldly, the most strong-minded, nay, even the most impious characters, blindly to throw

themselves, heart-broken and humbled, into the arms of religion, abandoning all their worldly wealth, for sackcloth, prayer, and mystic raptures? Are there not, in fact, a thousand circumstances in which the reaction of the passions produce the most extraordinary transformations, and the most tragical events, in the lives of both men and women? But you are ignorant of the immense resources produced by partial or mutual annihilation, which, playing on the human passions, if skilfully managed, either by combining, opposing, subduing, or exciting them, more especially when, perhaps, thanks to a powerful auxiliary, those passions become redoubled in their ardour and in their violence.'

Such is the bill of fare of the forthcoming volumes; which, we sincerely hope, we shall not be under the necessity of perusing.

All our readers will naturally say, after reading this faithful analysis of the work, 'Hitherto we have seen nothing but the Jesuits; where is the Wandering Jew, who gives its title to the work?' We cannot answer the question, except by a supposition, a surmise; for the Wandering Jew appears but once in his real character, without acting, and in the few events in which, we imagine, he acts a part, it is under a sort of incognito. But then we find, not only a wandering Jew, but also a wandering Jewess; not, indeed, pursuing together, so as to alleviate their mutual fatigues and hardships, their endless journey; but always marching in opposite directions, without ever meeting; and only once casting a glance at one another, at the beginning of the work, in the '*Prologue*,' from which we now give some extracts, to make our readers acquainted with the descriptive and imaginative genius of our author.

'The polar sea surrounds with a circle of eternal ice the inhospitable shores of Siberia and North America; the extreme limits of Asia and America are separated by Behring Straits. September is now at its close; and the shortening gloomy days are succeeded by long stormy nights. The dark blue sky, intersected by lines of violet, is hardly illumined by the sun, whose disk level with the horizon feebly shines on the dazzling gleam of the snow, which extends over immense steppes. To the westward, this inhospitable desert is bounded by a rocky coast, of rugged and gigantic description; at the foot of which lies the frozen ocean. . . . No human being seems able to explore the solitude of these regions of frosts and tempests, famine and death;—yet strange, the snow which constantly covers the deserts at the extremities of the two continents, is marked by footsteps of human beings! On the American shore, the marks of footsteps, small and light, clearly bespeak the traces of a woman, who has bent her course towards the rocks just described as overlooking the snowy steppes of Siberia, while on the Asiatic side, the same impression, but larger and deeper, betrays the heavy march

of a man, who has also directed his journey towards the Straits. One would suppose that this man and woman, thus arriving from opposite quarters, at the extreme points of the two continents, had a hope of gaining a glance at one another, across the narrow sea which separates them.'

Eugene Sue is too good-natured to disappoint them, though he seems not to know them ; and repeatedly asks, who they are ? He immediately produces an aurora borealis, much superior to any that ever was seen ; and at the same time, in spite of the Alpine mountains of ice, he creates a mirage, which has the desired effect. 'On the Siberian cape, a man, on his knees, was extending his arms towards America, with an expression of deep despair ; while, on the American promontory, a young and beautiful woman replied to the despondent attitude of the man, by pointing to heaven.' Then, again, our author asks, Whence came, and who are these two creatures ? and he closes his prologue, discarding them altogether, until in the epilogue, at the end of the first volume, the man alone is re-introduced in the character of Wandering Jew, to make a speech.

We greatly suspect that, though he is not mentioned, it is the same personage who seeks, all over the world, the members of Rennepont family, and delivers them their medals ;—who, when General Simon, being ordered, at the battle of Waterloo, to carry a battery with his cuirassiers, just when the artilleryman was applying the match to a cannon, in front of which stood the general, placed himself at the mouth of the cannon, and after the discharge was not a bit the worse for it ;—who, having been strangled and buried by the Thugs, in India, some time afterwards crosses the path of his murderers, to their utter consternation ;—who, in fine, is the invisible promoter of the supernatural incidents crowded in the work. As to the woman, the wandering Jewess, there is little doubt that she is the identical beautiful lady who brought the codicil at the meeting in the house, in Francis Street.

It is time to conclude our observation ; and we cannot dismiss the work without expressing our concern at seeing, every day, advertised in the newspapers, translations, not only of this insane publication, but also of the other works of the same author,—works of an equally, and perhaps still more objectionable character. We were in hope that the morbid appetites of our neighbours would not find any one, in our country, disposed to a deplorable rivalry. In this we have been disappointed ; and, as public journalists, we feel bound to caution our readers against the poison, both moral and intellectual, of which they are so urgently invited to partake. Were not the works in question obtaining a wide circulation amongst us, we should not have so

far deviated from our ordinary practice, as to notice them. It is certainly discreditable to our modern literature, that such publications should be reproduced, at a time when we boast of the progress of reason, and of the advance of religion among us.*

Art. IV.—*The Philosophy of Christian Morals.* By Samuel Spalding, M.A., formerly Student of the University College. London: Longman. pp. 430.

WHEREVER civilization has supplied materials of history, we learn that man's inward nature has not failed to be an object of his curious and inquiring thought. This nature, as developed in consciousness and in outward act, is capable of being an index to his destiny on earth, and beyond the present scene. Man has a glimpse of his destiny even in the savage state. The most barbarous tribes have not confounded all sense of moral distinctions. Even to them there is a right and a wrong. Among the most degraded of the Africans, who to cursory observation might hardly seem to show any consciousness of a moral nature, we still find a certain dread of supernatural power, though it may be expressed wholly in such superstitious fears as that of offending the *rain-maker*; and we see a lingering gleam of the doctrine of immortality in their custom of calling over the dead.

With the progress of civilization, the grand problem of man's moral nature and destiny becomes a necessity of his intellectual life. Its solution is perpetually attempted, never lost sight of, ever renewed in various forms. In the absence of revelation, we find this problem, in some of its cases, forming the main element of the speculative philosophy which marked the development of mind in the great historic nations. We see it attending the civilization of the East, the Grecian, the Roman. It is successively reproduced in every one of the systems of philosophy which were the only sources of a rational religion then within the reach of mankind, with the exception of the Hebrews alone. It appears floating on the surface of each system, and is found in their inmost and most mystic depths. It may

* The foregoing article was written for our March number; and, since its reception, Eugene Sue has resumed the publication of his work, and realised our anticipations. It is an abominable, and, at the same time, stupid production; but it seems that nothing else can, at present, gratify the taste of French readers. All the daily papers imitate and emulate the '*Constitutionnel*.' The principal organ of the government, the '*Journal des Débats*,' is now publishing, in its *feuilletons*, a novel, equally immoral and disgusting; and one of the proprietors has just been rewarded with a peerage, in addition to the £480, allowed by the government monthly to the other proprietors. In the doctrinarian system, to govern a people, it is to enslave and to corrupt them.

be traced through the Zend-avesta, the school of Plato, of Aristotle, of Zeno, of Epicurus, of the Eclectics. From the precious remains of antiquity which preserve to us the attempts of man to solve the vast and mysterious problem of his destiny, we might frame a catalogue of all the questions most interesting to our race. What is man? What is the moral economy of the world in which he dwells? What estimate are we to form of his present condition? of the strange moral anomalies which he presents to our contemplation? What are man's duties on earth? Is that which is visible the whole of man? When death has changed his countenance, and all consciousness seems fled—when the body is dissolved, and nothing remains of it but 'ashes to ashes and dust to dust,' what views are we to entertain of man? Has the thinking conscious principle really perished in the wreck of the material frame, or does it survive the ruin, and retain its noblest faculties in some new mode of existence? What is that existence? Is it a more immediate contact with the Power that made the universe? What is the nature of the unseen world? Is it a state of retribution? What are the destinies of the beings who inhabit it? How shall man be assured of finding, on that unknown shore, the elysium of bliss on which all minds but the most debased and grovelling have, in moments the most free from earthly passions, loved to dwell?

Of these momentous questions, Christianity offers the only authoritative solution. It is true, indeed, that before the Christian era, and where the Jewish scriptures were unknown, man's inward nature had already borne testimony in favour of a morality in its main substance harmonizing with that of revealed religion; and the one power that formed all and upholds all, had not wholly escaped the eye of reason penetrating through the dark veil of polytheism: nor was immortality, as a fond and pleasing dream of the spirit, unknown to man. But as there was no adequate and unappealable authority to give weight to the more spiritual and elevated speculations of philosophy, she had nothing to encourage her to aim, on the grand scale, to be the regenerator of mankind. Either from policy, or a lingering and sincere vassalage to opinion, she was compelled to descend too much to established prejudices and existing superstitions to prove an effective reformer of ideas and of morals. Socrates, who talked so sublimely of the Deity, ordered a sacrifice to Æsculapius. Philosophy could not establish Theism, nor fix in the popular mind any practical conviction of an hereafter, nor stem that flood of atheistic licentiousness which came in with the last ages of the Roman civilization.

Since Christianity, then, has set at rest the most practical part of all the great questions relating to man's destiny, may we not

conclude that, in reference to these subjects, the vocation of philosophy has long since wholly ceased? We have, now, a religion which no progress of civilization, no advancement of the human mind, no political or ecclesiastical revolutions, have been able to dislodge from the basis of evidence on which it stands, and it appears gradually tending, by visible advances, to the final occupation of the whole earth. For, to use the language of Jouffroi, the great ornament of the school which is regenerating philosophy in France: 'Christianity has too strong a foundation in truth ever to disappear as paganism did: its destruction was but a dream of the eighteenth century, which never will be realized.' We have a religion which, various as are the opinions respecting its relation to the civil power, its modes and forms, and certain parts of the grand whole, presents to the vast and overwhelming bulk of the millions who acknowledge it as their faith, (if we may judge from their public Confessions,) to Catholic, Greek, and Protestant, one and the same broad outline, one and the same general scheme, one substantial response to the questions of deepest interest to mankind. Ought we not, then, at once to discard altogether, for the future, the attempt to throw any light upon the subject of man's moral nature and destiny by the aid of philosophy?

There are those who would reply in the affirmative; and no doubt from the best intention, that of enhancing the value of Christianity. Men are to be met with of acknowledged personal excellence, and not destitute of education, who do not see the importance of philosophical inquiries into the fundamental laws of man's moral nature, with a view to general ethical principles and system. Such men, however, are seldom of an order of mind greatly to influence opinion. To persons of a more reflective cast, it becomes something more than a mere luxury of the intellect—it is a kind of necessity, to ponder and revolve in thought those moral phenomena which have, for so many ages, occupied the attention of the master-spirits of the earth. While Christianity has given to us, with a voice of authority, practical rules of life adapted to every degree of civilization, the task is still left to human reason to inquire, as it may be able, into the *rationale* of the relations which subsist between those rules and the nature of man. There must be fundamental laws of man's moral being, as of his physical constitution; and these laws cannot but be in real harmony with the testimony of a revelation from heaven, correctly understood. Moral philosophy may be defined, an attempt to trace to general principles what is described in scripture as 'the work of the law written on the heart.' This law, it will be remembered, is there spoken of as the proper guide of pagans; 'their conscience bearing witness, and their thoughts in the mean while accusing or else

excusing' them.* There is, then, an inscription, by the finger of God, on man's inward nature; which, however obscured and defaced through the working of selfishness and passion, may still be traced by diligent and painstaking observation. There is a moral constitution, the natural powers and principles of which, notwithstanding the perversion which has been made of them in practice, still indicate significantly man's destiny as an accountable being, and point to the general duties which he ought to discharge.

There are two extremes on this subject against which those who would arrive at truth should endeavour carefully to guard. The one is that of considering ethics, pursued exclusively on the principle of reasoning from the actual phenomena of the moral world, as a *final science*, a science wholly complete in itself for all purposes. Wherever a revelation from heaven is acknowledged to exist, an inductive philosophy of man's moral nature, or, in other words, a reply uttered by the voice of reason, *alone*, to the momentous questions which concern the entire range of duty and happiness, should obviously stand as but a fragment, though a very important fragment, of the whole truth respecting man as a moral being. The remarks of Dr. Chalmers in his *Bridgewater Treatise* are applicable both to natural theology and natural ethics. 'The theology of nature and of the schools, the theology of the ethical class, though most unsatisfactory when treated as a terminating science, is most important when treated as a rudimental one. The great error of our academic theism, as commonly treated, is that it expresses no want; that it reposes on its own fancied sufficiency. It is no reproach against our philosophical moralists that they have not stepped beyond the threshold of that peculium which is strictly and appropriately theirs; or not made incursions into another department than their own. The legitimate complaint is, that on taking leave of their disciples, they warn them not of their being only yet at the outset, or in the prosecution of a journey, instead of having reached the termination of it. Moral philosophy, even in its most finished state, is not what may be called a terminating science. It is at best but a science *in transitu*, and its lessons are those of a preparatory school. Its contains the rudiments of a nobler acquirement.'

We are strongly reminded by some of these appropriate remarks of the contrast subsisting between the self-satisfied tone of some modern ethical systems, which are well described as '*expressing no want*;' and the conscious want of something beyond themselves which is expressed in the speculations of some of the great moralists of antiquity. We must content

* Rom. ii. 15.

ourselves with referring, at the foot of the page, to several passages of Plato by way of illustration.* It is a singular fact (and it *is* a fact) that after Christianity had been shedding its light on the moral nature of man for sixteen or seventeen centuries, we have seen the rise of successive systems of ethical philosophy possessing far less of moral elevation, systems far more cold and heartless, far less animated with an humble and reverent spirit, than we may find among those who lived in the dark depths of paganism, centuries before that light arose. Can we, then, wonder that the Christian moralist should feel jealous of much that has styled itself ethics, in modern times? that he should maintain that ethics, if based on reason alone, is then, only legitimate when avowedly not a final and 'terminating' science? and that he should express dissatisfaction with any system which comes forth in such a manner as to overlook the fact that it is not a full and perfect response to all the moral necessities of man? Natural ethics may furnish a true theory of morals; but how to remedy the want of conformity which there is wont to be in man with the rule of his own nature—how to harmonize man with himself? is 'a question to which our human reason can return no certain and satisfactory reply.'†

But if modern philosophers have often erred on the side of excess, by propounding inductive ethics, or ethics as derived solely from observation and reason, as though it were in itself a final and complete science of man regarded as a moral, accountable, and immortal being—a science self-contained, and adequately meeting the moral wants of our nature as it now is; on the other hand, there are those, who, as it seems to us, fall into the opposite extreme, and err by defect, in wishing to shut up all inquiries respecting man's moral nature within the covers of the sacred volume. It is surely interesting, and it is important to the general cause of truth, to seek in a natural morality materials which may exhibit the harmony of the voice of man's nature with the voice of inspiration. Truth cannot but be always consonant with truth. Its evidence may flow from different sources, but all its lines must ultimately converge to the same point. We might as well propose to find a circle whose radii should meet in two centres, as to imagine that what is true as attested by a clear consciousness, or by a just observation of nature, is not true as connected with religion. No one, surely, excepting in burlesque, would now think of maintaining the assertion of Hoffman, once divinity professor at Helmstadt, that 'what is true in philosophy is false in theo-

* Phæd. § 78. Epinom. § 8, § 11. De Repub. iv. § 5. De Legib. i. § 11. Apolog. Socrat. § 18. Alcib. ii. § 22.

† Whewell's Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, November, 1837. Vid. p. 50.

logy!' A keener irony against truth could not have been spoken in jest; nor a doctrine more self-contradictory have been uttered by a sceptical philosopher! Some there are, however, sincere believers in Christianity, who are satisfied to neglect any light which speculative philosophy might throw on the principles of ethics. This is to forget that philosophy and theology are, so far as they proceed in the same career, but two distinct replies to the grand question of man's destiny. It is true that Christianity advances far beyond the point where philosophy halts in her course; but so far as that course continues, it is mutual; they run on in parallel lines. For if we find that there are, in any system, elements hopelessly irreconcilable with Christianity, we are able to pronounce that system, even when examined by the light of our own minds, a 'philosophy falsely so called.' Such is that ethical theory, for example, which would identify morality, in all cases, with human legislation, or social custom: a principle which is fatal to the very idea of a real moral law; and on which, also, the Christian axiom that we 'ought to obey God rather than men,' has obviously no meaning whatever, and therefore no obligation.

None will deny the assertion that man's highest destiny on earth is not to follow passion or self-interest, but *duty*. Hence arise two questions, the one objective, the other subjective:—what is virtue? and, by what faculties of man's nature does he distinguish between right and wrong? To these questions, and they are compendious of all others on the general subject of morals, philosophy aims to give an answer. The solutions which are within her reach are the product of the mind by means of a self-review, combined with the observation and the history of man in general. There are, it is beyond doubt, fundamental laws of thought and feeling, a constitution of our intellectual and moral nature which, so far as its province extends, is decisive and final in impressing us with the conviction of truth. Should any one refuse to admit certain primary and intuitive elements in our mental structure—if he were to deny, for example, that his mind is cognizant of a universal and necessary truth in such a proposition, as that *two magnitudes are equal to each other when each is equal to a third*, or that *every change must have a cause*, all argument with such an individual would be at an end: there is no common ground on which to reason. It is by means of confidence in the connate laws of our mental constitution that we believe in Revelation itself. Even its evidence respecting the moral attributes of the Deity becomes convincing by its harmony with the general ideas of goodness which nature teaches us to form. Why do we appeal to a revelation from God as decisive of all the questions of which it treats? Is it because we are told in the Scriptures that 'God

is truth?' On what principle do we then believe this declaration? If it should be replied that we do so ultimately on the authority of God himself; we must then believe already that God is true, in order to have a ground for receiving the Scripture declaration of his truth. We cannot, therefore, escape from a natural theology, and a natural ethical philosophy, even if we would.

It is likely that one main cause why philosophical inquiries into morals have failed, in this country, to inspire more confidence, is that much of the ethical philosophy which has been taught by authority, has been of a character so defective and unsatisfactory. It has in fact been far less elevated in its general principles than the teaching of Plato, or of the Stoics; and it has been, in some respects, below the current moral sentiments of mankind. Especially have the ideas of moral obligation which have been derived from religious sources, always and justly prevented Paley's views from being generally received; though his work has long formed an element in our ancient university-system. Surely that is far from being a lofty view of human virtue which recognizes the impelling motive to it as centering in self; and which represents that good is to be done to man, and obedience rendered to God, 'for the sake' of happiness. What is virtue, on this principle, but the enlightened pursuit of gratification, instead of being something which is pursued for its own sake? * A great name will not atone for the reduction of moral principle to a kind of expediency, nor for the lax morality discovered in some of its practical applications. We are not surprised that there has been of late a re-action in some influential minds at Cambridge against this text-book; and we think that the University of London has done wisely in so far neutralizing its tendency on the minds of students, as to introduce Butler's *Three Sermons on Human Nature* into the examination for the Bachelor's degree.

The prevalence of systems of moral philosophy which are not true to man's better judgment and feelings, (that is not true to nature,) or which appear on the face of them alien from the spirit which pervades the ethics of Christianity, has no doubt tended to create, in some earnestly Christian minds, a jealousy of all attempts to construct an ethical system out of the elements of man's nature, viewed in connection with its actual moral phenomena. Some object to these attempts, one and all; mainly on the alleged ground that the present state of man is such as to preclude the deduction of any true moral system from the observation of nature. As man is both the observer and the observed, it is alleged that his conclusions must be doubly affected by the moral evil which attaches to his present con-

* See Paley's *Moral Philosophy*, Bk. i. ch. 6.

dition; hence the moral constitution of man, as he now is, cannot present a fair exhibition of what God wills, or afford any correct index to the principles of moral rectitude. 'This is the argument of Dr. Wardlaw, in his popular and excellent work, entitled 'Christian Ethics.' We confess, however, that notwithstanding our high respect for its venerable and truly christian author, we have not been able, after carefully perusing it, to avoid the conclusion that it is one of those books which err by a unilateral and partial view of the subject. If philosophers have too frequently appeared to supersede christianity by treating natural ethics as though it were a 'terminating' science, a perfect and complete guide to man; we think that the respected writer we have named has fallen into the opposite extreme of attributing too little to human nature, as a source of theoretic morals. On his principles it becomes necessary to limit and qualify, in a greater degree than seems to us admissible, the scriptural representation above alluded to respecting the Gentiles doing 'by nature the things contained in the law,' and being 'a law unto themselves;' shewing 'the work of the law written on the heart.' To us there appears no satisfactory sense of these words which does not admit that man has *moral faculties* which are sufficient, even in a state of paganism, to guide him to a certain degree of virtue, provided only that he were inclined to pay suitable attention to their dictates, and to endeavour after the knowledge and the fulfilment of duty, with the same pains which he has been willing to devote to the acquisition of wealth, power, learning, or fame. For how else, we may ask, can there be any consistent meaning in the language: '*so that they are without excuse?*' To suppose that the present state of human nature renders void all attempts to frame a theory of morals, true as far as it goes, from an examination of the human mind, is, as it seems to us, to confound the perversion of man's faculties in use and act, with their essential native tendency and design. When it is said that 'they (the pagans of antiquity) did not like to retain God in their knowledge,' it is evident that all the awful evils which are spoken of in connection with this state of mind are referred to a voluntary source. It was not the intellect, but the *will* that was at fault. Had they chosen carefully to trace the path to which the voice of reason and moral feeling called them, had they anxiously sought to follow up the hints and indications of conscience, though they might still not have been exempt from all error as to duty, (and even christians are not exempt,) they would never have deviated so lamentably as they did from this 'law written on the heart.'

Those who hold the views to which we have above referred as

to the sources of ethics, may congratulate themselves on having so competent and distinguished a representative of their sentiments as the excellent person to whose work we have just referred: but considering the weight which his name and well-merited reputation are likely to give to his opinions, we cannot help regretting that he should, incidentally, and unintentionally, have contributed, as we think, to depreciate one important source of the internal evidence of revelation, the harmony of its utterances with the voice of man's intellectual and moral nature, as heard audibly in the midst of all the din and uproar of the passions. Some of Dr. Wardlaw's statements might lead his readers to imagine that a theory of natural ethics must necessarily be framed on the principle that the average practical morality of mankind must be made the standard of morals. This, however, is by no means the case. The various and conflicting moral phenomena of human nature are one thing, the conclusions which may be deduced from them another. Hence we find very many ethical systems, both in their principles and rules of conduct, rising far above the sensuality, the selfishness, the pride, the injustice, and the malevolence, which are too commonly to be found in the actual practice of men. Whence then comes the superiority of the esoteric doctrines and precepts, to the exoteric manifestations? *Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor*. Such moral systems as we speak of have existed, it will be remembered, before the date of christianity. Will it be said that they were made up of remnants of tradition, handed down from man's creation, or diffused over the earth from Judea? The supposition requires to be confirmed; and even were it proved, it would be most interesting to endeavour to gather together and contemplate these *disjecta membra* of man's original moral nature. But when it is considered that there were materials for the tradition of evil, as well as of good, that there have always been many evil maxims current in society, and many more evil examples, why do we find that, in the moral systems alluded to, the good has been so much selected in preference to the evil?—the very same good, to a remarkable extent, which we find in the precepts of christianity itself? Surely it was because the good, however disaffected man's *will* might be towards it, still found a response within him which the evil did not, an echo from his reason and his conscience, which amounts to the voice of a 'law written on the heart.'

It will hardly, we suppose, be questioned that there has always been a greater difference between men's characters than between the moral rules which they might on deliberation be brought to acknowledge. If passion and self-interest had been

generally admitted in theory as the true guides of life, we should find it to have been one principle of natural ethics that the gratification of appetite, or the intense pursuit of every thing which centres in self, is more worthy to be followed than the pleasures of benevolence or the duties of religion. But where do we find any such doctrine pronounced to be a part of morals? Crimes may sometimes be regarded as venial through vicious custom, even in the face of the christian precepts; but there are actions and states of mind which conscience and society every where condemn. Duelling may be varnished over with the false colouring of honour, but where was murder in cold blood regarded as no crime? What conscience or sane reason ever deliberately smiled on *malice prepense* as a virtue? Selfishness may steel the heart and belie conviction, but which of the ancient moral systems would repudiate a regard to the rights of our neighbour, practical beneficence towards the needy, or the excellence of truth for its own sake? Covetousness may dictate the obtaining of property by whatever means, however fraudulent; (*quocunque modo rem;*) but where shall we find simple unmixed fraud inculcated as a social duty by any pagan writer on ethics? It has been said that at Sparta theft was not regarded as a crime, but rather as a virtue. It is true that the boys of the *Homæi* were compelled at times to wander about the country, and to live by petty plunder as they could, being subject to punishment only when they were caught in the fact: but it should be remembered that the articles which they were allowed to take, such as cheese, fruit, and the like, were all determined by law, and the object was to harden the boys for warfare, and to prevent the Laconians from remaining secure in possession of their lands. No doubt this practice, as well as that of the *crypteia*, or annual military excursion, in which the Helots were the principal sufferers, was really wrong, and barbarous enough, but they may with tolerable fairness be put on a par with the colonial oppression, and the cruelty towards slaves, of which unhappily nations calling themselves christian, and with the laws of Christ in their hands, have been far from guiltless. We have no proof here that dishonesty, deceit, and bad faith or injustice between man and man, were regarded at Sparta, theoretically, as elementary principles of virtue. In the *Provinciales*, Pascal shews how elaborately the Jesuits of his day perverted all moral principle. This was done in the light of Christianity; sometimes under the mask of quotations from its sacred books. Here was an acknowledged law, but how sadly was it tortured into the contradiction of itself! What wonder then if the 'law written on the heart' has been found disregarded, or strangely distorted in heathen countries! Cer-

tainly it is not in those countries alone, but in countries also where even a perfect rule of conduct is known and admitted, that we find evil perpetrated in the name of good, or even without this excuse. Ingratitude is no very rare phenomenon in society, pagan or christian; but where was it ever contended that ingratitude was a virtue? or that children ought not, as a general duty, to honour their parents? The want of a due sense of religious obligation is surely not uncommon among men; but in what community was it denied that reverence was due to acknowledged deity, believed to take cognizance of human affairs? What moralist ever condemned the principles of generous forgiveness exercised towards a personal enemy, or inculcated private revenge as a virtue? Where did benevolence and cruelty, as such, change places, or stand on an equal footing of indifference in the moral estimation of mankind?

Awful as are the perversions of elementary moral principle and the examples of degeneracy which are to be found in the moral history of our race, it would not, perhaps, be a difficult task, in all cases of moral agency, to detect an original element, often deeply disguised, and strangely warped from its destined purpose, but still in itself good, or at least not evil. A convex mirror grotesquely distorts and caricatures the features, but we can still discern the traces of nature. Appetites and passions, and self-interest, may, we know, outrage all morality: but this does not prove that appetites and passions, and a rational self-love, are not original parts of the human constitution; or that there is no inward principle whose proper office it is to testify against crime and to reward virtue. It only proves that, by some disorder and derangement in the action of the moral powers, the inferior impulses have gained the ascendancy, which we are too aware may take place even where reason and conscience are informed by revelation—where christianity is perpetually pointing to duty, and lifting her voice against evil. The dormant testimony of the inner man to virtue, is often revived even in the most unfavourable circumstances. We learn from christian missionaries that even pagans may be induced, by reasoning with them, to admit the evil of the most flagrant disorders of appetite and passion, and of the more deliberate courses of conduct which, in the form of superstition, are opposed to objective morality. Before we deny that there remain in man the elementary principles of a natural morality, we must take into the account the morbid growth of these organic elements, besides the revolt of the will against reason and conscience. If the Hindoo mother sacrifices her infant to the god of the Ganges, what do we here see but a melancholy perversion of the sentiment of religion? We have an example in the

Mosaic history of a divine command overcoming the parental instinct, and all previous moral considerations, in the case of Abraham, who in consequence prepared to sacrifice his son; and we shall not be misunderstood to palliate infanticide in admitting the fact that superstition may produce the same outward action as a genuine call of religious duty, intended as a trial of faith. Locke speaks of a practice, in some countries, of putting to death children who have lost their mothers, or who are pronounced by the astrologer to have 'unhappy stars:' but may we not discern in cases of this kind a sentiment, however spurious, of benevolence? If we are compelled, in some of the examples adduced by the above distinguished writer, granting their authenticity, to admit the operation of a gross selfishness, as in the case of the neglect of aged and infirm parents; we may again remark that it will hardly be denied that examples of intense selfishness, amounting almost to the extinction of natural affection, might be found where the written law of christianity is known. That a *theoretical* agreement among mankind as to the prime elements of morality may be detected in a final analysis of the principles on which men everywhere admit they ought to govern their conduct, we have no doubt, however passion, self-interest, evil custom, superstition, or the like, may often give a wrong direction to these elements, overpower their force, or even appear to destroy them. The existing low moral condition of pagans, is no more incompatible with a moral constitution in man which, if properly heeded, would lead to virtue, than the existing moral evils in christian countries are incompatible with a knowledge of the letter of the Christian law of duty; and that they are not incompatible with such knowledge is only too evident a fact.

It may further be remarked that the 'law written on the heart' is the criterion by which we judge of one most important portion of the general evidences of christianity, namely the internal. For why do we feel that the precepts of the New Testament, its laws of supreme love to God, love to our neighbour as ourselves, doing to others as we would they should do to us, the forgiveness of injuries, benevolence to all, and the like, recommend themselves to our consciences, but because they harmonize with this very law there written—because, however conscience may be benumbed, perverted, or enchained, the utterances of pure moral truth and beauty are no sooner made decidedly to arrest the attention of the mind, than conscience is felt to give them a distinct echo and response from her inmost and apparently most obstructed recesses? If we could for a moment suppose that our sacred books inculcated, as duties, what we now regard as breaches of morality, or declared that the Deity

was a being whose moral attributes were injustice, falsehood, impurity, and malignity, instead of justice, truth, holiness, and benevolence, no reflective person could receive the testimony, any more than the most thoughtful men of classic antiquity really believed all the legends of the gods. The very constitution of our nature would as effectually prevent our recognizing such a communication as worthy of respect and belief, as though it contained a geometry which set out with a denial of those axioms, or primary and common notions, which are presupposed in all demonstration; or as though it propounded a sceptical metaphysics which should deny the objective reality of the 'me,' or our conviction of the universality and necessity of causation wherever there is change in the natural world.

As, then, there is a constitution of the human frame which is the foundation of physiology, or the doctrine of the normal functions, animal and organic, notwithstanding all the morbid changes and deviations which take place in disease; so there is a constitution of man's moral nature which is the foundation of a natural ethics, or the doctrine of the normal functions of that nature, notwithstanding man's departure from the line of rectitude. That the cases are not strictly parallel we admit. Ill health may be only temporary to the individual, and is always partial in the race; while the fact of man's departure from the rule of right has been universal, in all ages and nations. Reason and conscience are always liable to be more or less blinded and perverted by the morbid condition of the *will*, in the abnormal exercise of which lies the essence of moral obliquity; and besides; there are duties dependent on revelation which reason never could discover in detail. We are not, however, contending that nature is, or can be, a complete and perfect guide. But to deny that the general elements of true ethical science may be gathered from the mind and the relations of man—the elements of a theory much superior to the average practical morality of mankind, is to overlook the fact that Socrates ever taught, or that Plato, and Aristotle, and Confucius, and Cicero, ever wrote. On the other hand, the abuse of natural ethics, wherever christianity is known, is to treat it as a complete and final science, instead of regarding it merely as a fragment of a great whole, corroborative, so far as it extends, of christianity, which adds authority to the voice within the breast, and alone can solve the still higher problems relating to man's destiny—those problems on which natural ethics, and natural theism, have either been dumb, or sceptical, or fabulous. Then only is an inductive philosophy of ethics legitimate, when it professes to be what it is, or what it ought to be; namely, an attempt to ascertain how far a system of moral principles and

rules may be framed from a careful inquiry into the constitution and faculties of man, the various relations he sustains, and the actual moral phenomena which he exhibits. It must come forth with the express warning that it is not to be regarded as a substitute for revelation, but as only preliminary to it: so that where natural ethics leave off as insufficient, there Christianity enters her own more peculiar province.

We have already suggested that a natural system of moral philosophy can present no points which are really at variance with the representations of Christianity. There is also another criterion which may be applied *à priori* as a test of the possible truth of any system; namely, its consistency with the fundamental idea of ethics, the idea of a law of obligation. For instance; a necessity that precludes the power of forming resolves, destroys the essential subjective preliminary to such a law; for by shutting out human freedom it renders obedience and disobedience equally impossible. Thus Anthony Collins maintained that man is in such a sense a necessary agent, that there neither is nor can be such a thing as liberty. On this principle, of course, there could be neither virtue nor vice. The Pantheistic system, also, is inconsistent with ethics, by denying the personality of moral agents. According to Spinoza, man is only a mode of the development of Deity. Our souls are forms of divine thought, our bodies of divine extension. Pantheism sees in man only a phenomenon, not a reality; the only reality is God, the one sole being, the one sole cause. Man has no causation; his acts are not his own; they are the acts of the One-All. Man is thus deprived of his individuality, and therefore of his capacity of sustaining the character of a moral being. The sceptical philosophy, too, from its birth in Greece to the modern Pyrrhonism of Hume, is only consistent when it boldly denies all moral distinctions. This necessarily follows from the assertion, common to Carneades, Sextus Empiricus, and the whole school, that every thing is mere appearance, and nothing can be known as truth: an assertion respecting which Kant has acutely remarked, that it assumes both a distinction between mere appearance and real truth, and some mark of that distinction; consequently it presupposes some knowledge of truth, and thus contradicts itself. It is evident that, on the principles of philosophical scepticism, there can be no certain ethics; and, therefore, no definite moral obligation. Again; wide as was the chasm between scepticism and mysticism, when swarms of the population of Egypt retired to the deserts of the Thebais to be wrapped in contemplation, and when the sublime truths of christianity were blended with the wild vagaries of theurgy, and the perfection of man was deemed to consist in a kind of slum-

ber of the spirit, in which it dreamed, but did not act, a state of passive ecstatic reverie, in which it was lost to all converse with the affairs of men, and was entranced in an ideal world, where all activity of every kind, bodily and mental, was alien from the grand object of being absorbed in the unseen : the tendency of this mysticism was evidently to weaken and at last to confound those moral distinctions which an active engagement in the duties of life tends so much to keep before the view of the mind. Hence the mystic Plotinus boldly denied the difference of actions, and asserted that there was neither good nor evil.

If the above systems preclude, *à priori*, in different ways, the operation of a law of obligation, there are others which virtually deny it. Such are all the systems of self-interest, of which, among the ancients, Epicurus, and in modern times, Hobbes, may be regarded as the leading representatives. For if self-interest is the only law and guide of man, there is no room for the ordinary ideas of right and duty ; all is determined by a calculation of which self is at once the spring and the object : the pursuit of personal well-being, either as aimed at immediately, or as seen to mix itself up with the well-being of society, is the principle of morality. In this eudemonism, disinterested motive is lost sight of ; duty and self-interest are synonymous terms. The modern form of the ancient system of Epicurus may be found in the theory of Paley ; also in the utilitarianism of Bentham ; who, however, as a jurist, rendered great service to society by applying the principles of utility to legislation, a far more legitimate sphere for them than the sphere of morals. The same general theory of ethics is maintained, in its strongest form, by an able recent writer, Mr. Mill ; who states that the utility of an action and its morality are two names for the same thing, and that motives have no moral character.

Other systems recognize the fact of disinterested motives ; but differ widely from each other, both as to the objectivity of virtue, and the subjective faculty by which it is distinguished. Some find virtue solely in the constitution of the human mind ; while others recognize an absolute objective rectitude, distinct from the benefit which good actions produce, and distinct from the faculties of man ; a good founded in the eternal nature of things. Each of these two classes of moral systems also differ among themselves as to the nature of the moral faculty. Some represent the actual distinction between right and wrong as a matter of *sentiment* or feeling, in the form either of an instinctive impulse, an inward kind of sense or tact, or a susceptibility of emotion. Others refer the distinction to the operation of *judgment* or reason.

To the school of *sentiment* belong, with various modifications,

Shaftesbury, Hutcheson, Hume, Mackintosh, Adam Smith, and Brown; who maintain that good is tested by a *moral sense*, either primitive, or of secondary formation (so Mackintosh) in connexion with the principle of association; or by *sympathy*; or by our moral *emotions*. To the *rational* school, or those who derive the idea of good from a perception of judgment or reason, belong Cudworth, Price, Wollaston, Malebranche, Clarke, Montesquieu, Leibnitz, Wolf, Ferguson, Reid, and Stewart; and of the French eclectic school Cousin and Jouffroi. Some of these writers regard good as an *indefinable idea*, others resolve it into *truth*, or *order*, or the *nature or fitness* of things, or into *perfection*, or *excellence*, or the like. To this class also belongs Kant, who thus forcibly, on his own principles, describes the origin of the idea of good:—‘In every case where reason begins to act, it annexes to actions the predicates *right* and *wrong*, and this is a necessary and universal operation of thought. The rule ‘Thou shalt not promise falsely’ is valid not only for man, but reason cannot figure to itself any intelligent being in the universe at liberty to deceive. The legitimacy here predicated of truth has both necessity and universality, *i.e.* is *à priori*, and is no perception taken from observation and experience. Reason enjoins every intelligent being to act rightly, *i.e.* conformably to an ideal practical law, and the formula expressing the law may be thus stated: ‘So act as that the maxim of thy will might be announced as law in a system of universal moral legislation.’ That this moral law is a synthetic proposition *à priori** is obvious, and every man has, however darkly, an unchanging and necessary perception of it.’†

In the posthumous volume before us Mr. Spalding maintains the *objective* character of morality; and he belongs to the school of *sentiment*, inasmuch as he regards *emotion* as the criterion of virtue. But before exhibiting his opinions, let us state some particulars respecting him. During his course of study at the University College, London, in addition to high certificates of honour in other classes, he obtained five First Prizes, in the classes of Hebrew, French, Natural Philosophy, and the Philosophy of the Mind and Logic. Of the latter subject his pursuit was ardent, and his diligence and ability, as manifested in the *viva voce* examinations, and in his essays, left a distinct and

* Synthetic propositions (or judgments) *à priori*, according to Kant, are those in which the predicate is not already contained in our conception of the subject; and which, taken in their full extent, have not their origin in experience, but in pure understanding and reason, and are universally and necessarily true; *e.g.* every change must have a cause. That neither of the two following propositions, *all bodies are extended*, and *some bodies are heavy*, complies with the above conditions is evident.

† Vid. Kritik der Praktischen Vernunft.

lasting impression on the mind of his instructor, blended with a sense of his moral worth, more grateful in the retrospect than any mere intellectual pre-eminence, especially that he is now no more. In the transactions of the University, his name is mentioned with honour for his examination in Animal and Vegetable Physiology, and in the Hebrew and Greek originals and the history of Scripture. On taking his master's degree, in 1840, he is recorded as having 'passed a distinguished examination in logic, the philosophy of the mind, and moral philosophy.' In consequence of this examination, he was urged by the examiners to write on some of these subjects; and we learn that 'this recommendation encouraged him to write the following work.' Unfortunately, his health already undermined by too great application to study, broke down under the effort; and the book possesses a melancholy interest from the fact that its preparation accelerated the fatal termination of his disease.

Soon after taking his degree, Mr. Spalding went to Italy, in hope of benefitting his health; and during the two years of his residence there he composed this volume; which, however, we are informed was 'the result of many years' close investigation and reflection.' Having returned to England, in 1842, with his health still further impaired, he determined on trying, as a last refuge, the effect of a sea-voyage.

'With this object,' says his biographer, 'he left his native land for the Cape of Good Hope, in September, 1842. During the voyage, he suffered extremely, and on his arrival at Cape Town, was in a state of great debility. Fully conscious that his end was approaching, he used to speak of death with calmness and frequency. On the 14th of January, three weeks after his arrival, his medical attendant stated that his dissolution was near. The intelligence produced no alarm in the bosom of the dying man; for on being asked whether he felt any dread at the approach of death, he replied, 'No; I rest upon the Rock of Ages*—this has supported me—it does support me—and it will support me. Christ is able to save to the uttermost.'

'Almost the last words he uttered were expressive of the gratification it afforded him to think that he had lived to finish the work. With great composure, the result of Christian faith, he resigned his spirit into the hands of his Saviour. His life was a fine illustration of that exalted benevolence which forms his leading topic in the following pages.'

Mr. Spalding maintains that it is from *emotion* alone that we learn to distinguish between right and wrong; but he decidedly holds the objective reality of these distinctions, and

* Isa. xxvi. 4 (Heb.): authorized version, 'everlasting strength.'

resolves the idea of good into that of *benevolence*. The following are some of the principal doctrines contained in the volume: Our primary notions of morality are derived from the moral feelings produced in us in contemplating the conduct of others; and these notions must be thus gained before conscience can approve or condemn our own actions; virtue itself, and the mode in which it should be exhibited, are the objects of moral obligation; the rule of virtue is the will of God, either as revealed or as inferred from the end and object of the virtuous affections; virtue is benevolence, and all other right dispositions are its necessary consequences; feelings purely pathological (sympathy, or compassion, for instance) have no moral value; it is volition that marks the character of any pathological feeling; thus the choice of benevolence as a principle, and not the mere existence of natural kindness of disposition, makes the latter morally valuable; the moral character of the volition depends entirely on the object of our choice.

With regard to the process of mind by which we first arrive at the ideas of *right* and *wrong*; the author remarks that an object is called blue, or red, simply because it produces in us a certain sensation, which we cannot help referring to a cause. Exactly in the same manner the bare presentation of certain actions of others to the view of the mind, produces in us certain emotions, which we refer to their causes. When the contemplation is followed by a feeling of moral approbation, we say the action or state of mind—that is, the cause which originates the feeling, is right; when we disapprove, we say it is wrong. After experiencing the emotion, we cannot help thus referring it to its cause or antecedent, and this cause we call virtue or vice. There is always a preceding ‘intellectual perception or conception’ necessary to excite the emotion; but it is the emotion itself, so referred, which makes us think of the cause, (that is, certain actions, or dispositions of others) as right or wrong.’ The emotions are the origin of the judgment which we are now able to pronounce on the character of these antecedents. Mr. Spalding, however, states that it is only in regard to the *origin* of the ideas of right and wrong that he contends for the priority of the emotions to the judgments. When the relation in which a whole class of actions can be regarded has been learned by experience, he says that we can at once pronounce a particular action to be right or wrong, according to the class to which it belongs, without any necessity of feeling in the given instance, a previous emotion. Thus (to adduce an instance which is rather pathological than strictly moral), we may say that an object is fearful, by referring it to a class, without feeling the emotion of fear at the time. ‘But,’ con-

tinues our author, 'to suppose that the notions of right and wrong are perceived by the understanding, is contrary to all analogy. The source of all abstract general ideas is found in our observation of resemblances. An object is admirable because it agrees with other objects in exciting in our minds a certain emotion termed admiration, not because the mind first perceives its admirable qualities.'

So far as relates to the manner in which we acquire the notions of right and wrong, our author appears exactly to coincide with the views of Dr. Thomas Brown; though he greatly differs from that distinguished writer as to the question—what is virtue in itself? Both maintain that the bare contemplation of certain actions, apart from all express or even tacit reference to general rules or principles, is sufficient to give us, by means of the attendant emotions, the notions of virtue and vice. 'We call an object red which produces in us a certain sensation. Exactly in the same manner, we call an action right or wrong which produces in us a certain emotion,' an emotion of moral approbation or the reverse. It is evident that although the author admits that an 'intellectual perception, or conception,' precedes all our emotions, both moral and others, (without which indeed the mind could no more have an action in its view, than the blind eye could see a material object,) he supposes no such mental operation as would amount to that cognizance of *relations* in which the pure or elementary acts of reason appear to consist. The moral emotion is consequent on the mere isolated view of the conduct of others. Some action of theirs, viewed as detached from all its bearings, is immediately followed by our approval or disapproval: we contemplate the action with no more exercise of the power of perceiving co-existing relations, than though we, for the first time, saw a body fall to the earth, and took cognizance only of the bare event. Is this theory borne out by facts? It would certainly seem that, in children, the moral sensibilities, both in reference to their own conduct and that of others, are developed in proportion to their power of perceiving certain relations in which actions can be viewed; that is in proportion to the growth of reason. Consciousness, also, in after years, appears, we think, to testify that we can hardly frame to ourselves the conception of a moral action as a mere abstract antecedent to emotion: the action always presents itself to our contemplation, in connection with surrounding circumstances, and relations. Whether the notion *right*, and the notion *wrong*, be completely formed, or not, before emotion has been felt, either in the form of complacency or aversion, it appears to us, at all events, that reason (we do not say a process of reasoning) cannot be excluded from some share in producing the result.

That there is some operation of the rational faculty in the formation of our moral notions, appears to be very generally admitted, and is the doctrine of several of the best recent writers. By some, reason is supposed to comprehend the relations in which moral agents are placed, and, when these relations are contemplated in connexion with certain actions, or dispositions of these agents, we feel moral approbation or disapprobation, by an ultimate law of the mind. Thus, we comprehend by reason, it would be said, the relation subsisting between a recipient of benefits and a voluntary disinterested benefactor; and, in contemplating ingratitude in the recipient, we cannot help feeling an emotion of dissatisfaction or disapprobation. And, generally, a conception of various relations of moral beings, in connexion with that of certain actions, is immediately followed by an emotion, after feeling which we pronounce the action good or bad. On this principle, reason and emotion seem to run, as it were, into one point to produce the result. This is the view of Dr. Wayland, whose work on 'Moral Science' we hope to take an early opportunity of noticing. The difference between this theory of the moral faculty and that of our author, is, that the former makes a perception of the *relations* of moral beings to precede the emotions, which perception the latter discards. Both theories, however, find the origin of the idea of moral obligation in our emotions. Dr. Payne advocates the doctrine that reason takes cognizance of relations; but he speaks of 'moral judgments,' as giving us the notions of right and wrong previously, in the order of nature, to the emotions arising. Wayland would object to this view, on the ground that when we unite a subject and predicate together in a judgment, we already have the notions which are signified by these two terms: for if we say 'this action is right,' we have already the notion *right*; as we have the notion *green*, when we say 'the grass is green.' Jouffroi, with the phraseology of another school, places the notion of moral distinctions in a light not very different from that of Wayland; namely, as arising from a certain blending of reason and moral sensibility, in reference to the idea of 'universal order.'

The following are Mr. Spalding's views with respect to conscience; whose operations he regards as requiring previous notions of right and wrong derived from a view of the conduct of others.

'It is admitted that it is utterly impossible to gain our notions of virtue and vice from the emotions of moral self-approbation and remorse; because neither virtue nor vice can exist where there is no notion of either; and as these emotions are always consequent on virtue and vice, they must also be consequent on our notions respecting the same. But these remarks will not apply to those moral emo-

tions which arise from our consideration of the conduct of others. It is to these emotions that we must look for our primary notions of virtue.'

If we rightly understand these and other remarks of the author on the subject of conscience, he is of opinion that its emotions cannot give us ideas of good and evil, unless in so far as these emotions are dependent on our moral ideas already formed by contemplating the conduct of others. Our spontaneous moral approbation and disapprobation of the actions of our fellow-beings give us primary notions of right and wrong; but we never could, by any possibility, have these notions in connexion with any feeling of self-approbation or self-condemnation, unless we had first obtained them from the above source. Now on this principle, it would follow that a solitary human being, whatever intelligence he might possess, could never, by means of his own moral nature, acquire the notion of moral obligation. This is certainly opposed to the general opinion of ethical writers: who have considered one department of morals to be the relation of man *to himself*, from which they deduce rules of personal morality, such as would belong to one shut up in a desert island. Those who doubt that there is such a branch of natural ethics, should read the writings of Epictetus, or Marcus Aurelius. A human being supposed to be situated as described, would, moreover, sustain relations to his Maker, which would not be altered by the fact of his isolated existence; and which, it is not difficult to suppose, might be perceived without the contingent that there should be more than one human being. If the conception of certain actions as belonging to another, gives rise to approving or condemning emotions in us, what reason is there why the conception of actions as our own, should not be followed by self-approving or self-condemning emotions? Otherwise, if we imagine a perfect creature alone in the creation, and intelligently adoring his Creator, we must conclude that he could feel no such consciousness of doing right as should encourage him to continue in this his path of duty.

On the subject of natural ethics, we are glad to find that Mr. Spalding dissents from the opinion that the introduction of moral evil into the world has affected the intellectual powers and the moral constitution of man, to an extent which renders almost useless any attempt to discover a correct theory of morals from an examination of the human mind. We quote the following remarks:—

'If it had not been for the depravation of man's nature, all subjects would have been considered worthless in comparison with ethics. The knowledge of the laws of matter would have been considered as nothing in comparison with that subject which teaches

man the original dignity of his nature, its capacities for virtue, its relationship to God, and its capabilities of continued and eternal development in moral power. The most obvious effect, then, of the fall, is to turn men's minds away from the contemplation of the subject: man 'does not like to retain God in his knowledge.' It is important, however, to distinguish between general and particular consequences. The real question is, not what have been its effects on man in general, but what effect it has had on the minds of those whose attention has been specially turned to the subject; those whose aversion to the subject has been counteracted, from whatever source that counteraction has arisen. That in general their conclusions have not been vitiated by depravity, or other causes, may be argued on many grounds, and especially from the great majority of the lessons which they inculcate. In fact, ethical writers with but very few exceptions, either in ancient or modern times, do not contend for any state of mind as virtuous, which is not, in one relation or other, represented as virtuous in the Bible. That they have not agreed on some higher parts of the system, must be admitted. The reason is that the subject is one of immense difficulty. It is not surprising that in the higher parts of the science there is a diversity of opinion. There is no such diversity of opinion, however, on what is most important to the interests of man. There is, indeed, a striking difference as to the *source* of our *notions* of virtue and vice; but as to the notions themselves, there is a striking conformity. Men in different ages, in different countries, with various temperaments, of opposite character, while differing with regard to the rank of particular virtues, all agree upon the broad distinction between moral good and evil. This striking agreement, therefore, on so important a subject, is a sufficient proof that God has written the broad line of duty in deepest characters in the human mind. If, indeed, man could cease to know the distinction between virtue and vice, he would be reduced to the condition of a brute, and his responsibility would be at an end.'

The question, however, to which Mr. Spalding proposes more particularly to apply himself, is that which relates to the *nature* of virtue. Our readers will be aware that this is an inquiry which has for its object to discover that state of mind, in a moral agent, to which we apply the epithet virtuous. This problem is, of course, quite distinct from the former, in which the question was, by what faculty or faculties of the mind do we acquire the *notion* of virtue? Our author admits that there is truth in the statements; virtue is that which tends to produce the greatest personal happiness; it is a mean between two extremes; it is that which causes moral approbation of ourselves or of others; it is useful to mankind: but he justly regards these facts as only partial and inadequate answers to the question, what is virtue? In advancing towards the exposition

of his own views on the subject, he properly distinguishes between outward actions and the state of mind with which they are performed. For it is evident that the same actions, merely as to what we may term the *matter* of them, are compatible with very different subjective conditions or states of mind in the agents.

‘The mother who sacrifices her child to false gods, may feel the highest complacency when she reflects on her conduct, because it is considered by her as the decisive evidence of her consecration to those idols which she vainly adores. The inhabitant of Europe feels the greatest horror and indignation at such crime; but it is only because to him such an action is the index to a very different state of mind. He understands, in some measure, the relations in which he is placed; he knows that God abhors such sacrifices; he sees in the natural and instantaneous tenderness of a mother’s bosom towards her hapless offspring, not only the expression of the Divine will, but also the overflowing goodness of the Divine mind itself, toward the same object; and therefore he cannot but regard such an action as a certain indication of the want of that love from which perhaps, in some instances, it actually proceeds. The Hottentot does not therefore approve of what is wrong. Man, whether civilized or uncivilized, approves of devotion to God; the judgment respecting the manner in which it is to be displayed is different; the one conceives it to be evinced in a mode which is uniformly the effect of vice in the country to which the other belongs, and the latter cannot but hold it in detestation and abhorrence.’

The above just remarks illustrate the obvious importance of distinguishing between what the agent does, and the agent himself: an action, viewed objectively, may be conformable to the highest relations in which man is placed; while the agent’s state of mind may be deficient, or wrong. On the other hand, the agent’s intention may be right, while the action itself is not conformable to the moral order of the universe, that is, to the relations of the agent. Again: for an agent to be moral, he must be rational, and voluntary: to be virtuous in the highest sense, both his intention, and his action itself, must be in harmony with the various relations in which he is placed. An agent may act from a right motive, while he may err in the manner in which he carries his intention out into act. On this distinction, which, in some of its bearings, involves considerations which have always been perplexing and painful to reflective minds, it will be allowed that, at all events, Mr. Spalding makes some luminous and discriminating remarks, founded on an instance recorded by Dr. Adam Smith, and on the case of infant immolation among pagans.

In his chapter on ancient systems of morals, our author reviews the definitions of virtue given by Aristotle, Epicurus, and the school of Zeno. He regards their theories that virtue con-

sists in a certain mediocrity of the affections, or in seeking an agreeable life, or in living conformably to the law of nature, as either deficient, or erroneous, or obscure; but he, nevertheless, pays a high and deserved compliment to the superior elevation and sublimity of the morals of the Porch. He next discusses the opinions of some of the modern writers on the nature of virtue; Clarke, Wollaston, Payne, Hutcheson, Edwards, Hume, and Brown: who have, respectively, placed the essence of virtue in acting conformably to the fitness of things, or to truth, or to the relation in which we are placed, in universal benevolence, in what is the same thing benevolence to being in general, in a utility which excites approbation, and in the relation of certain actions to certain emotions. To each of these theories Mr. Spalding more or less objects, though his own views on the nature of virtue come nearest to those of Hutcheson and Edwards, who make it to consist in universal benevolence. He excepts against Dr. Payne's definition, which is nearly identical with that of Clarke and others, that it would render mere pathological affections virtuous: thus the desire of knowledge, for example, though in harmony with our relative situation, is not necessarily virtuous. 'Virtue,' says our author, 'must lie, not in the conformity merely, but in the state of mind which produces it.' Now if we understand Dr. Payne aright, this is exactly what he would say: maintaining that virtue is such a conformity of man's affections and actions to the relations in which he stands, as is produced by a voluntary aim to do right. We observe, also, that, in connection with the above remark of the author, he states that Dr. Payne is 'not of the intellectual school' of morals: this, however, is incorrect according to Mr. Spalding's own description of that school as holding that right and wrong are perceived directly by the understanding. For, as we have seen above, Dr. Payne clearly maintains that moral judgments must always precede moral emotions. It is probable that this writer's views of conscience as strictly an *emotion*, though consequent on moral judgment, may have led Mr. Spalding into this oversight. Whatever view we may take of the theory that conscience is an emotion, and that our notions of right and wrong originate purely in judgment, it is evident that the two statements are by no means incompatible. The disadvantages under which the lamented author of the interesting volume before us composed it, (for he was away from home, and in a foreign country,) and the fact of its posthumous publication, demand that a candid interpretation should be put on these and some other blemishes which would, probably, have disappeared under the final revision and editorship of the author himself: we allude to errors in the orthography of proper

names, and occasional confusion of sense, possibly arising from the state of the manuscript. After having discussed the different theories above alluded to, our author proceeds to state his own views of the nature of virtue, which, as we have before remarked, he regards as consisting in the single affection of *benevolence*.

‘When we say that all virtue consists in the supremacy of this one affection, it must be carefully remembered that we do not wish to deny the term to many others which are currently esteemed virtuous. The proposition we wish to maintain is that love, chosen by the mind as its governing principle, and hence giving it the determination to act in accordance with the various relations in which we are placed, is the first great cause of these moral emotions; that this is the original source to which all other virtuous states of mind must be ultimately referred; and that these latter become the object of moral approbation only in consequence of the relation in which they stand to the great principle of benevolence; apart from which they would possess no moral virtue whatever. In a word, just as we have shown that actions are not virtuous, but merely the evidence of a virtuous state of mind, so certain states of mind, deemed virtuous, are only so many evidences that we possess the great principle of love to God or his creatures.’

Since, according to our author, we say that an agent has done virtuously when, on contemplating his conduct, we find it producing in us a certain emotion, (or as others would say a certain perception of relations, or a certain moral judgment;) it may be contended that, if virtue and benevolence are identical, then whenever we thus say that an agent has acted rightly, we ought to have in our minds the distinct impression that his impelling motive was benevolence. Now is this actually the case? When the truth is spoken, for instance, or an act of justice is done, no doubt we see exemplified a general principle which benefits society, but do we demand that the idea of this benefit as a motive, shall be in the mind of the agent, before we pronounce his conduct, as far as it goes, virtuous? Suppose a person in a court of justice giving evidence decidedly against his own personal interest and advantage, and that we could know that no motive is present to his mind but that of doing what is right in itself: undoubtedly, we should approve his conduct, though the notion of benevolence does not present itself in connexion with it. Objections of this kind are made by Butler, Price, and Brown, to the theory that virtue is always identical with benevolence; and we think they are not fully rebutted by our author. We would not, however, be supposed for a moment to question that benevolence to man is an essential element in by far the greater number of those modes of conduct, having a direct bearing on society, which are denominated virtuous, as being objects

of universal moral approbation. Much less would we hesitate to admit that love to God is the principle which alone can stamp human agency with the highest character of virtue. There is no doubt that it ought to be the pervading and impelling motive of all human conduct, as it most perfectly harmonizes the human soul with the eternal source of all order and moral beauty, and renders virtue no longer an abstraction, but a union and a communion, as it were, of the finite with the infinite. Still there are degrees of conformity with the relations in which man is placed, that is degrees of virtue. The preponderance of conscience when it just turns the vibrating balance in favour of right, because it will not be silenced, is different from a ready, cheerful, enlightened, obedience, emanating from devout love to God as the source of all moral excellence, the fountain of all moral law. In both cases the human agent would be doing right; though it is in the latter case only, that he would be doing so in the highest sense. In this case, benevolence towards man, also, would be diffused through all social relations to the utmost possible extent. On these principles, we cordially sympathise with the author in the prominence he has given to benevolence, under which he includes love to God and man. Of these two forms of the general disposition, he has given various glowing and beautiful illustrations.

As our author insists largely on the claim of 'love' to God and man to be the highest principle of human conduct, and so extensively deduces from it the duties of social life, he of course maintains the usefulness of virtue, both to the individual and to mankind in general. While, however, he recognizes the uniform tendency of virtue to promote happiness, he rejects the theory that a moral action is right merely *on account* of its utility; for if so, says Mr. Spalding, we should find that whenever we contemplate our own actions, or those of others with approbation, we do so in consequence of their tendency to usefulness being present to our minds, which is not the case. We approve of gratitude to a benefactor, when we witness it; we think of the martyr to truth and principle with approbation; and the emotion arises in us, instantaneously, without any immediate view of the real tendency of the actions to benefit society.

We should be glad, if our limits permitted, to follow the author in other illustrations of the principle of benevolence, which he traces through a variety of duties. This development of the general principle occupies, either directly or indirectly, the larger portion of the volume, and is exhibited in numerous passages of genuine eloquence. We are bound in justice to say that the extracts we have given are by no means to be regarded as specimens of the greatest power and beauty. The delineation

in the eleventh chapter, corresponding to the heading, 'Love personified in the Saviour,' and the closing pages of the volume, which treat of the 'future triumphs of Christianity,' are peculiarly worthy of attention : but throughout the whole work there is an elevation of thought and of sentiment which are well calculated to recommend it to the intelligent and reflective. We can assure the reader that, although embracing the most difficult points of a difficult subject, it is anything but a *dry* book. The author writes with the glowing warmth of one whose whole heart is in his subject ; sometimes with an intense ardour of feeling. The book is, on this account, of a more popular cast than is usual with treatises on the principles of ethics ; though it often discusses principles ably and profoundly. It also exhibits more successfully, we think, than is sometimes done, the relation which subsists between Christianity and the moral nature of man : illustrating the real harmony of the Christian precepts with the genuine dictates of the moral faculty, notwithstanding all apparent and supposed discordancies. Though some of the theories advocated may be regarded as disputable, involving as they do points on which the most celebrated inquirers have differed, and though some allowances must be made for the work, as a posthumous publication, there is shown, in its investigations, a talent for philosophical discussion, an independence of mind, a freedom from prejudice, a love of truth, a freshness and simplicity of heart, a devout and benevolent temper of mind, which altogether throw a charm over the volume, and render it a valuable contribution to ethical literature. We would particularly recommend it to the attention of theological students, perfectly free as it is from all sectarian and party feeling, and avoiding as it does both the extremes which, as we have already shown, it appears to us that different writers have fallen into, on the subject of ethics. The enlarged and catholic spirit of the writer, we may add, is repeatedly manifested ; and the 'division and strife' which are too often witnessed on the subject of religion, evidently occasioned much grief and pain to a mind so exquisitely attuned to the harmonies of moral truth and benevolence.

- Art. V.—1. *A Bill to Amend two Acts passed in Ireland for the better Education of Persons professing the Roman Catholic Religion, and for the better Government of the College established at Maynooth for the Education of such Persons; and also an Act passed in the Parliament of the United Kingdom for Amending the said Two Acts. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, April 3rd, 1845.*
2. *Resolutions of the British Anti-State-Church Association respecting the Maynooth Grant, March 26th.*
 3. *Resolutions of the Committee of the Congregational Union of England and Wales respecting the Maynooth Grant, March 12th.*
 4. *Resolutions of the Committee of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland respecting the Maynooth Grant, March 26.*
 5. *Resolutions of the Deputies of Protestant Dissenters of the three Denominations in and within twelve miles of London respecting the Maynooth Grant, April 9th.*
 6. *Resolutions of the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations residing in and about the cities of London and Westminster respecting the Maynooth Grant, April 1st.*

THE government of Sir Robert Peel is in some respects the most extraordinary which has ever ruled this country. Its distinction, however, is not of a proud and ennobling order; it does not consist in the possession of pre-eminent ability, in the breadth and capaciousness of the views entertained, or in the consistency of its measures with the principles avowed and the professions with which it took office. The least scrupulous of its advocates will scarcely venture to found its claims on these grounds. They are manifestly foreign from the merits of the existing administration, which, nevertheless, possesses an unenviable notoriety, a character *sui generis*, which will separate it from all others in the judgment of an impartial and discriminating posterity. We can readily imagine the perplexity of some future student of political history who shall employ himself in the investigation of these times, with a view of doing justice to the men by whom their course has been shaped. Commencing with the advent of Earl Grey to power, and passing onward to the period when Lord Melbourne finally resigned the seals of office, he will meet with an active and organized party, stealthily adapting its phraseology to the altered aspect of the times, renouncing the title by which it had been known, discarding, in words at least, some of the dogmas long deemed essential to its creed, and seeking, under the guise of popular sympathies, to regain its forfeited power and resuscitate the spell by which the popular mind had for generations

been bound. Assisted by the hesitancy and aristocratical prepossessions of the Whigs, he will find this party steadily gathering strength, recruiting itself by desertions from their ranks, adroitly availing itself of their blunders, obstructing many good measures, and rendering cordial support to every bad one, until at length, their rivals having worn out the patience of a deluded people, the triumph was completed in their own accession to power.

Such an investigator will naturally look to the subsequent history of this party for an illustration and enforcement of the views advocated in opposition. It would be deemed an insult to their memory—an indignity and a wrong, to suppose that in the one case they would belie all the professions they had made in the other,—that their passion for office could be so intense, their recklessness of principle so marked, as to induce them to do the work of the free-trader, or to fraternize with the dissenter, the jew, and the catholic. And yet, what other conclusion will he be able to form after a patient and laborious examination of the facts of the case. The elements composing this party consisted of the modern representatives of the old Tory school, and the pledge they gave to the country was that of protection to monopoly, whether in the senate, the market, or the church. This pledge was uttered in every form of speech, and was reiterated on all occasions. Every possible sanction was given to the faith of their credulous adherents. Men of the highest note and of the most authoritative position amongst them, those who were known to be in the confidence of their leader,—nay, that leader himself, at sundry times, when he deemed it befitting to disclose his purpose, bound himself hand and foot to work out the policy which had cramped the industrial energies of the people, and fed the bigotry and intolerance of a protestant hierarchy. These were the professions made, the good tidings which cheered the drooping spirits of the squirearchy and the priests. There was a revival, in appearance at least, of ancient loyalty; not, indeed, to the person of the monarch, but to those interests for the maintenance of which alone the monarchy was deemed important. Sir Robert Peel and his associates were summoned to a special vocation. It was theirs to arrest the revolutionary course of events, to throw back the tide of democracy, to protect the home market from foreign competition, and above all to guard the established church from the profane hands of infidels, dissenters, and catholics. They took office on these conditions; their advent to power was hailed on this account. They were to be the regenerators of their times,—the honest, unflinching, and always-consistent friends of the agricultural interest and of the protestant ascen-

dancy. And yet what have we seen? How have these promises been fulfilled, these pledges redeemed, this line of policy worked out? What has been the result of the vast and costly efforts which were made to secure their triumph? For the honour of our common nature, we are ashamed to reply to our own inquiries. There was little faith in public men left amongst us, before this last and most disgraceful defection; but he must be strangely ignorant of the universal conviction of the people, who now ventures, with a grave countenance, to descant on the integrity of politicians, or to calculate on public virtue interposing any barrier to their possession of power. The great mass of the people would laugh to scorn the man who should so attempt to delude them; or would deem him so simple-minded and uninformed, as to be fit only for the regions of the moon.

We are far from thinking this a light matter. It weighs heavily on our spirits, and throws a shade over the prospects of our country which we would gladly see removed. The reputation of our statesmen is public property, which cannot be damaged without the nation being a loser. It is no mere personal thing, but a deep fixed inherent evil, which will show itself in a thousand morbid forms throughout the body politic. Whatever impairs the credit or destroys confidence in the integrity of our rulers, weakens public morals, and facilitates the progress of anarchy and scepticism. The national mind resents in such circumstances the semblance of virtue as an insult to its common sense, and either ceases to feel interest in public affairs, or looks about it for a new and more trustworthy set of political leaders. There is much to incline it to the former course, in which case its liberties are sacrificed to an unprincipled oligarchy: whilst the latter requires an enlightened estimate of its rights, and a conscientious determination to maintain them.

That some of the measures of Sir Robert Peel have been in a right direction we freely admit, but this admission impairs not the force of our regret, at the irreparable injury he has done to the reputation of public men. The benefits of his administration are his disgrace as a tory minister. The boon which he confers is bestowed at the cost of his official integrity. He has not the manliness either to abide by his former professions, or to avow the change which circumstances have forced upon him, but is content to exercise the dictatorship of a party, at the price of carrying the measures of his opponents.

A singular illustration of this is afforded in the Bill which he has just submitted to parliament. To this measure, then in prospect, we referred last month, and now recur to the subject with feelings of earnest solicitude to discharge our duty as public journalists in what we deem a momentous crisis.

On the 3rd of April, the premier moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Acts relating to the College of Maynooth, and in the speech with which he prefaced his motion detailed the immediate changes which he contemplated, without committing himself to an opinion, yea or nay, respecting the ulterior measures which might grow out of them. On these he observed a discreet if not an honourable silence, and our main business therefore at present is to ascertain the precise nature of the proposition which he submitted to the House, and the lessons to be derived from the reception with which it met.

The measure of the premier involved three things. In the first place it is provided 'That the trustees of the said college or seminary' (we copy from the Bill) 'and their successors for ever, shall be one body politic and corporate, by the name of 'The Trustees of Maynooth,' and by that name shall have perpetual succession and a common seal.' This corporation is empowered, notwithstanding the statutes in mortmain, to purchase and enjoy property, whether real or personal, to the extent of £3,000 a year, exclusive of the property already acquired by the trustees. This is a large extension of the power previously enjoyed, and gives a fixed and legal character to the institution, deserving of grave consideration.

The next point respects the provision to be made for the salaries of professors and the support of students, and here we shall best compass our object, which is a fair statement of the premier's case, by quoting his own words as reported in the 'Times' of April 4th:—

'I next address myself,' he remarked, 'to the provision to be made for the chief officers of the college. We propose that there should be a more liberal salary as compared with the present stipend of the president and professors. As I before said, the stipend of each individual professor does not now exceed £122 per annum. Instead of defining exactly what shall be the amount paid to each professor, we propose to allot to the trustees of Maynooth a certain sum, which shall be placed at their discretion for the payment of salaries. That sum will admit of a payment of £600 or £700 per annum to the president of the college; of £260 or £270 to the professors of theology; and of £220 to £230 to the other professors. We propose, therefore, that a sum not exceeding £6000 shall be allotted to the trustees for making provision for the officers of the institution. With regard to the students, I would just remind the house that the college, generally speaking, is divided into two departments. The senior department consists of three senior classes of what may be called divinity students, and are the persons from whom a selection is immediately made for the Roman Catholic priesthood. In the subordinate division of the college there are four classes. In addition to these two departments are twenty senior students, who

have passed through the college course with peculiar credit, called the Dunboyne students, because Lord Dunboyne bequeathed about £500 a-year towards their support. They are selected by the president, and allowed to remain three years; and each one is allowed £55 a-year, of which sum £25 goes to the college for the student's support. There are at present about four hundred and thirty students in the college, divided into these three classes: the Dunboyne students, the three senior classes and the four junior classes. We propose to allot to each of the Dunboyne students—that is, to twenty Dunboyne students, the sum of £40 each per annum. We propose to make provision on the whole for five hundred free students—that there shall be two hundred and fifty students in the four junior classes, and two hundred and fifty in the three senior classes, those being divinity students. That is to say, there are to be twenty Dunboyne students, and five hundred comprised within the two great departments. We propose that for the maintenance of each student, to cover the expense of his commons, attendance, and other charges, consequent upon academical education, a sum shall be placed at the disposal of the trustees, calculated on an average of £28 per annum for each student. We propose that to each of the students in the three senior classes, the sum of £20 per annum for their own personal expenses shall be allowed separately. This will require a very considerable sum. For the salaries of the professors, for the provision of a library, and for other expenses of that nature, that a sum not exceeding £6,000. For the twenty Dunboyne students at £40, the sum of £800 will be required. The allowance for the maintenance of five hundred students in the two departments, and of the twenty Dunboyne students, at £28 each, will amount to £14,560. The allowance of £20 each to the divinity students in the three senior classes will make £5,000. Thus we have a total for the annual charge on account of the establishment of £26,360. That will not be in addition to the present vote, but including it.'

The other point respects the repair and enlargement of the college building, for which a grant of £30,000 is proposed, with an additional charge *in perpetuo*, for the repairs of the same, to be included in the annual estimates of the Board of Works.

Such is, in brief, the measure now submitted to the British parliament, and it only remains, in order that the case be clearly understood, that the visitorial powers created by the Bill should be explained. Referring to these, Sir Robert remarked:—

'With respect to the visitorial powers of the college at present, for the ordinary purposes of education, it is exercised by certain judges, by parties who either were originally appointed by the Act of 1795, or have been since elected to fill up vacancies as they have occurred since that time. Now our opinion is that *ex officio* visitors are incompetent. We propose that the lord chancellor and the judges should be relieved from this duty, and that her Majesty shall

have the power to appoint five visitors, in addition to the elected visitors. But then we do not propose that those visitors so appointed shall exercise any powers of visitation other than the present visitors do. We propose, however, that there shall be *bond fide* visitations, and that they shall take place as a matter of course, annually, instead of triennially as is now the case. We propose also that the lord lieutenant should have the power of directing a visitation whenever he may think proper. But observe the visitorial powers shall not extend to any matter relating to the doctrine or discipline of the church of Rome. We will not spoil this Act by any attempt at undue interference with such matters. Indeed, it would be utterly ineffective for any good purpose. But no alteration will be made in the visitorial powers, which are to remain and be exercised as at present in all matters which relate to the exercise, doctrine, and discipline of the Roman catholic church. This visitorial power, however, cannot be exercised except by three visitors elected by the other visitors; and those three must be members of the Roman catholic church.'

We have thus succinctly stated the leading features of a measure, which, to the astonishment of all thoughtful men, the leader of the conservative party has commended to the adoption of the legislature. The excitement which has followed cannot well be overrated. It extends through all classes, partakes of various hues, and expresses itself,—sometimes in language of the fiercest intolerance, sometimes of an alarmed and unreflecting piety, and at others of an enlightened conviction of the folly and wickedness of the secular power attempting to legislate in matters of religion. Were we to judge of the measure from the arguments which—with two or three honourable exceptions—were adduced against it, in the Commons House, we should unhesitatingly give it our support, for any thing more flimsy or exceptionable, than the reasoning and spirit with which it has been met, we have never witnessed. It is marvellous that our senators should have retained to the middle of the nineteenth century, so many of the dogmas and so much of the spirit of the most intolerant age, and we may well be thankful, in view of the revelation thus afforded, for the protective influences which exempt us from the sufferings experienced by our fathers. If we had to choose between the intolerant bigotry so unblushingly avowed, and the latitudinarianism on which the ministerial project is based, we should not hesitate in our preference of the latter. In comparison, it is innocuous, and contains within itself some corrective elements, tending ultimately to the overthrow of the system which it temporarily extends. But we are not reduced to any such alternative. We protest against the measure as vicious in principle, incompatible with the legitimate province

of government, an insult to those to whom the grant is tendered, and a grievous wrong to the consciences of all who object to any appropriation of the public money to ecclesiastical purposes. The Conservative minister was warmly supported by the leader of the Whig section of the House. Lord John Russell, with all the warmth of a new born friendship—of which we have had several instances of late—came to his assistance, and the temper of his speech was indicative of the folly of those dissenters who look to his lordship as the *beau ideal* of a statesman. He was not satisfied with affirming the proposition of the Premier, but avowed his readiness to concur in any measure for the endowment of the Romish clergy; and that too, on the ground of his preferring the establishment system, to the voluntary principle. His words should be deeply pondered by every dissenter:

‘I must confess,’ said his lordship, ‘that, with those gentlemen who oppose it on the ground that both in the proposal itself of settling this grant by Bill, making it a permanent endowment, and in the reasons the right honourable gentlemen gave for that endowment, there is an indication of further measures than he himself proposed’ to night, or than the measure itself contains,—I say that with them I am inclined to agree so far, except that, although a ground of opposition with them, it is a ground of concurrence upon my part. The right honourable gentleman stated truly, at the end of his speech, that do what you will, the priests who are brought up in the Roman Catholic faith are to be the spiritual guides of the great majority of the people. He urged, I think most truly and unanswerably, that if that is to be the object, it is your interest that your education should be as good, that the doctrines taught should be of a nature as much to elevate, that the education should be of a character as much to improve, as it is possible by education to improve, the character of that priesthood. In that argument I fully and entirely concur; and upon that ground I shall be most willing to give my vote in favour of the proposal of the government to-night. But it is impossible to hear such arguments without bearing in mind the whole condition of Ireland as it respects this country. Now I am not going to argue whether even with respect to this particular question, the house should or not adopt the motion of which my honourable friend near me, (Mr. Ward) has given a notice; but this I say, that arguments which are so sound, and as I think so incontrovertible, to induce this house to found an endowment for the education of the Roman catholic priesthood, will prove upon another occasion as sound and as incontrovertible with respect to an endowment for the maintenance of that priesthood. For my own part, preferring most strongly, and more and more by reflection, religious establishments to that which is called the voluntary principle. I am anxious to see the spiritual, the religious instructors of the great majority of the people of Ireland endowed and maintained by a provision furnished by the state. I do not hesitate to give that opinion. I am not committing any person on the part of the government, I am speaking independently for my-

self, but I will not give this vote misleading any one by the notion, that if there came a question proposed in a manner in which I should think that it could practically and properly be carried into effect, for the payment of the Roman catholic priesthood, I should not think the reasons upon which I shall vote to-night equally conclusive to induce me to concur in that proposal.'

Of the noble member for London, we have frequently recorded our opinion. It has been in no grudging spirit that we have admitted the value of his past services; or sought to do justice to the claims of the Whigs on the gratitude of their countrymen. But our admiration has not blinded us to their faults, and we have long felt, what his lordship's speech,—illustrated by what he subsequently remarked in support of Mr. Ward's amendment—must now render evident to all but his blindest partizans, that the time of our separation has come, and that Whig alliances must be renounced in deference to the higher claims of religious duty. We have no disposition or right to censure his lordship's churchmanship. It has been known to us from the first, and has never been objected to as invalidating his title to our political confidence. But the case is materially altered, if his churchmanship involves an approval and support of new ecclesiastical imposts,—the organization, in fact, of another establishment at the cost, and in violation of the principles of the protestant community. In the former case, the plea of antiquity and of vested interests might be alleged, but in the latter, we see an unblushing sacrifice of the religious to the secular, a profane tampering with conscience in order to perpetuate the unrighteous domination of the Irish church. It will be for dissenters to say, whether such a course is compatible with their continued support of his lordship as a political chief. Our own decision is in the negative, and we have strong confidence that this decision will speedily be adopted by the great majority of our friends. We know what may be said—what probably will be said—against this, nor are we unapprised of its force, but we know also that we have rendered to the Whigs an ample return for the services they have done us. It is notorious—and the fact should serve to moderate the superciliousness of some Whig leaders—that the dissenters of Great Britain constitute the strength of the liberal party. Their support is more essential to Lord John, than his advocacy is to them; and he may yet live to feel, that in violating their consciences, and imposing on them additional church burdens, he is only cutting away the ground from beneath his own feet, and rendering himself as powerless as his position is a false one. We have been willing to bear with the churchmanship of our Whig allies. Whether right or not we have acquiesced in their protection of the existing hierarchies; but it is a totally different thing now that we are called on to submit to the

organization of a third establishment, for which, neither the plea of antiquity, nor that of truth, can be urged. In a house of 330, there was only one member found to protest against the measure, on its introduction, as an act of injustice to the British people, and that member, to his honour be it said, was Mr. Thomas Duncombe. Though unconnected with dissenters, he took a clear, straightforward, and honest view of the case, and with the manly bearing which is characteristic of his public life, he at once avowed, that he, 'would oppose the motion, because the vote was permanent in its character, on account of the sources from which the money was to be drawn, and also on account of the purposes to which it was to be applied. It was impossible not to see that the vote was intended as part of a scheme for the endowment of another church establishment in Ireland, to which the great majority of the people in this country did not subscribe. The measure had been called a restitution; he thought it an aggravated plunder; it might have been called a restitution had it been a measure for suppressing the established church in Ireland, and appropriating its funds to general education. He denied that it was a mere question of degree; it was a question of principle. They found this vote an annual one, and they had no more right to make it permanent than they had to do the same with the Mutiny Act or the supplies. On the voluntary principle he should give his vote against the motion, to which, in justice to a large portion of his constituents, he could not give his assent.'

The motion of the premier was carried by a majority of 102; the numbers being 216 for, and 114 against it. This result was anticipated, and became the signal for immediate and intense agitation. Meetings were held in every part of the country. Churchmen and Dissenters, and amongst the latter Methodists, Independents and Baptists were instantly on the alert. The most moderate amongst ourselves were foremost in the agitation, and spoke with an irritability and violence strangely in contrast with the censures they had been accustomed to pass on their brethren. Thousands of petitions were forwarded against the measure, a large proportion of which distinctly repudiated the right of the legislature to vote public money for the support of any class of religionists whatsoever. Efforts were also made to obtain time in order to allow a fair opportunity for the expression of public feeling, but the minister was immovable, and the second reading of the Bill was therefore moved for on the 10th of April.

Of the protracted debate which followed, it would be idle to attempt an analysis. It affords us little satisfaction, and was marked, even beyond the ordinary course of parliamentary discussions, by a singular misapprehension of the matter in debate,

an almost absolute avoidance of the principle involved, and the grossest possible misconception of the ground of opposition on the part of protestant dissenters. Men of various political creeds, tories, whigs and radicals vied with each other in the zeal of their advocacy, occasionally enlivening their otherwise dull harangues by party criminations, or the spleen of personal invective. Division of opinion was much more marked on the conservative than on the liberal side of the House. Lord John Russell, Mr. Macaulay, and Sir George Grey spoke the sentiments and gave a tone to the policy of their followers, while Mr. Hume, Mr. Roebuck and other radicals were sufficiently infatuated to lend their support to a measure which, if carried out to its legitimate results, will raise up another formidable barrier to the progress of freedom, and the social welfare of the empire. A more illusive plea than that which was urged by the liberal members, in defence of their votes, was never heard in parliament. Ireland, it was said, has been misgoverned, the catholic population has been oppressed, the rights of the many have been sacrificed to the interests of the few, religion and sound policy have been equally violated by the maintenance of a protestant hierarchy which the people spurned, out of funds taken from the people's church;—and, therefore, such was the non-sequitur of our legislators,—it was seemly and righteous to make all other religionists contribute to the support of an *ecclesiastical* institute which they deemed unscriptural and injurious—a fountain of error, a fruitful source of superstition and social debasement. One wrong was appealed to in justification of another; the outrage committed on the catholic was adduced in vindication of that proposed on the protestant. The misgovernment of centuries was to be atoned for by the perpetration of a new wrong of a precisely similar character, only on a different class of her Majesty's subjects. Protestant ascendancy was to give place, not to equality, for of that we are the advocates, but to the extension of the vicious principle of religious patronage to the catholic population. As they had loudly and justly complained of the inequity of being compelled to support a church which they disapproved, their remonstrances are met by a proposition, not to relieve them from this burden, but to subject the protestant community to the same intolerable load. The viciousness of the plan, and the hollowness of the pretexts by which it was enforced are seen out of doors. The common sense of the nation protests against the injustice, whilst our senators in utter contempt of the popular will, amuse themselves with the flimsiest pleas which a shallow philosophy can furnish.

We admit the many and grievous wrongs of Ireland. When other voices were silent we denounced them, and pleaded,

honestly at least, that our catholic fellow countrymen were entitled equally with ourselves to share the privilege of the British constitution. For these rights, to the utmost limit, we are still prepared to contend. The constitution is theirs as well as ours, and he is no friend to popular freedom who would exclude from its pale, or deprive of a fraction of its benefits, the worshippers in any temple, or the abettors of any religious creed. We have, however, yet to learn that this has any thing to do with a public endowment of the church, or with the training of the priesthood of the papacy. To the former, its adherents are entitled by the common tenure of citizenship, while from the latter, they are debarred by the sacredness of conscience and the voluntary nature of religion. Let right be done to Ireland. Let it be done in a generous and confiding spirit. Let it be done under a sense of our past misdeeds, and with a liberality which betokens repentance as well as justice. The first step, however, in this line of policy, the only one consistent with sound principle and enlightened legislation, is the entire extinction of the protestant hierarchy of that country. This is the bane of Ireland, the outward and visible token of her misrule and degradation. It stands out before the eye of Europe, an anomaly which no reasoning can justify, and for which no necessity exists. Ireland will never be pacified,—she ought not to be so, while this corporation is upheld. Its historical associations madden her sons, whilst its altars and worship are connected in their minds with the imprisonment, proscription and murder of their fathers. Our love of protestantism, therefore, combines with our sense of justice in demanding the overthrow of this system. There is no hope for protestantism in Ireland whilst it is presented to her sons through the medium of this politico-ecclesiastical institution. They regard it as their oppressor, the heartless creed of a tyrannical lord, deaf alike to the dictates of justice and the pleadings of mercy. To the overthrow of this establishment, the so-called liberal members of the House should therefore have addressed themselves; but instead of this they have sought to renew its lease of gain, if not of power, by buying off the most formidable body of its assailants. The old hierarchy is to be protected by the creation of another, and that too, not at its expence, but at the cost of the community.

It was well observed by Mr. Muntz, and we perfectly agree in his statement, that ‘he wished to see all classes and sects have the fullest, and the freest, and the fairest exercise of their religious opinions and worship. But that was one of his strongest reasons for opposing the pitiful measure now brought forward, a measure which the government ought to have been

ashamed to introduce, and the Irish nation ashamed to receive.'

So absolutely ignorant are our senators, of the first principles of religious liberty, that they congratulated each other on the service they were rendering to her sacred cause at the very time, and in the very act, by which they were violating her spirit and setting at naught her injunctions. So true is it that perfect religious freedom cannot co-exist with the establishment principle. We have long been seeking to work this conviction into the hearts of our people. They have been indisposed, however, to admit it. In their simplicity, they have continued to hope better things, and to turn a deaf ear in consequence to our counsels. Henceforth we need not reason. The debates of the past month have certified the fact, and to these we shall henceforth appeal in confirmation of our views.

The honourable members for Durham and Rochdale are entitled to our gratitude for their able exposition of the ground on which dissenters oppose this Bill. It is perfectly refreshing amidst the rubbish and lumber of the debate, the latitudinarianism of some, the besotted bigotry of others, the perverse misrepresentations of not a few, and the splendid plausibilities of two or three, to light upon the clear and statesman-like view which they took of the subject. No speeches were more practical at the same time that they were grounded on principles of universal and permanent application. It was with withering power that Mr. Bright, after repudiating the reasonings of many opponents of the Bill, and stating that his main objection was derived from hostility to the appropriation of public money to the support of any religionists, exposed the hollowness of the measure and its unfriendliness to the interests of the Irish people.

'The object of this measure,' remarked Mr. Bright, 'was to him just as objectionable, when he learned that it was intended by this vote to soothe the discontents which existed in Ireland. He would like to look at the causes whence this discontent arose. Did it arise because the priests of Maynooth were now insufficiently well clad or fed? He had always thought that it arose from the fact that one-third of the people were paupers—that almost all of them were not in regular employment at the very lowest rate of wages—and that the state of things amongst the bulk of the population was most disastrous, and to be deplored; but he could not for the life of him conceive how the grant of additional money to Maynooth was to give additional employment, or food, or clothing to the people of Ireland, or make them more satisfied with their condition. He could easily see how, by the granting of this sum, the legislature might hear far less in future times, of the sufferings and wrongs of the

people of Ireland than they had heard heretofore; for they found that one large means of influence, possessed by those who had agitated for the redress of Irish wrongs, was to be found in the support which the Irish catholic clergy had given to the various associations for carrying on political agitation; and the object of this Bill was to tame down those agitators—it was a sop given to the priests. It was hush-money, given that they might not proclaim to the whole country, to Europe, and to the world the sufferings of the population to whom they administer the rites and the consolations of religion. He took it that the protestant church of Ireland was at the root of the evils of that country. The Irish catholics would thank them infinitely more if they were to wipe out that foul blot, than they would even if parliament were to establish the Roman catholic church alongside of it. They had had every thing protestant—a protestant clique which had been permanent in the country; a protestant viceroy to distribute places and emoluments amongst that protestant clique; protestant judges who had polluted the seats of justice; protestant magistrates, before whom the catholic peasant could not hope for justice. They had not only protestant, but exterminating landlords, and more than that, a protestant soldiery, who, at the beck and command of a protestant priest, had butchered a catholic peasant, even in the presence of his widowed mother. All these things were notorious; he merely stated them. He did not bring the proof of them, they were patent to all the world, and that man must have been unobservant indeed who was not perfectly convinced of their truth. The consequence of all this was, the extreme discontent of the Irish people. And because that house was not prepared yet to take those measures which would be really doing justice to Ireland, and to wipe away that protestant establishment which was the most disgraceful institution in Christendom, the next thing was, that they should drive off the watch dogs, if it were possible, and take from O'Connell and the Repeal Association that formidable organization which has been established throughout the whole country, through the sympathies of the catholic priests being bound up with the interests of the people. Their object was to take away the sympathy of the catholic priests from the people, and to give them more Latin and Greek. The object was to make the priests in Ireland as tame as those of Suffolk and Dorsetshire. The object was, that, when the horizon was brightened every night with incendiary fires, no priest of the paid establishment should ever tell of the wrongs of the people amongst whom he was living; and when the population were starving, and pauperized by thousands, as in the southern parts of England, the priests should not unite themselves with any association for the purpose of wresting from an oppressive government those rights to which the people had a claim. He was altogether against this system for any purpose, under any circumstances, at any time whatever. Nothing could be more disastrous to the best interests of the community, nor more dangerous to religion itself. If the government

wanted to make the priests of Ireland as useless for all practical purposes as the paid priests of their own establishment, they should not give them 26,000*l.* merely, but as much as they could persuade that house to agree to. Ireland was suffering from the existence of two churches. Either one should be abolished or the other established; for with the present church having a small community, overpaid ministers, a costly establishment, and little work, it was quite impossible to have peace and content in that country. If possible give the catholic priests a portion of the public funds, as the government gave the regium donum to the presbyterians of the north, and they would unite with the church as the presbyterians did, against any attempt to overturn the old system of church and state alliance in that country. The experience of state churches was not of a character to warrant the house in going further in that direction.'

It will now be for the dissenters of Great Britain to take it into their solemn consideration whether they are not bound by attachment to their principles, by fealty to the religious convictions which they cherish, to exercise their elective franchise with especial reference to the preservation of religious freedom. The termination of the debate was as we expected, though the majority was undoubtedly greater. The second reading was carried, after six nights' discussion, by a majority of 323 to 176. On an analysis of the division, it is found, that the majority consisted of 165 liberals, and 158 conservatives: whilst in the minority there were 145 conservative, and only 31 liberal members. Amongst the conservative majority, were thirty placemen, so that had the question been left to the decision of the *unplaced conservative party*, it would undoubtedly have been rejected.

Such is the parliamentary position of the question. Let us now turn to the country, and see what has been the extent and character of the opposition offered to it. Of the former, it is sufficient to say, that the number of petitions presented up to the latest return we have seen, is 5,643. Considering the brief interval allowed, this is altogether unexampled, and should, of itself, have sufficed to make the House pause in its career. We can understand Sir Robert Peel, and his conservative supporters, in their contemptuous indifference to the petitions of the people: but what shall we say of the liberal members of the House, of the radicals as well as the whigs, the free-traders as well as the monopolists, the men who live by popular support, whose political status is founded on the representative principle, and who can descant with fluency when it serves their purpose, on the agreement which should subsist between the votes of St. Stephen's and the petitions of the people. There were honourable exceptions, amongst which, the mem-

bers for Durham, Rochdale, Finsbury, Ashton, and Birmingham, hold a distinguished place,—but, taken in the mass, the liberal party has forfeited its title to public confidence, and proclaimed, as with a voice of thunder, the necessity for some great and radical change in the representative system. It is not simply, that the petitions of the people were slighted, that those who assume to be their representatives felt themselves at liberty to reject their prayer. This would have been enough, and for the consistency of our public men, we wish it were all: but, as Sir Robert Inglis remarked,—with a point and truthfulness not always characteristic of his sayings,—the petitions of the people were referred to by Lord John Russell—and the observation is equally true of others—in ‘language which he certainly had not expected to hear from a great friend of civil and religious liberty.’ Well, the time will come—let protestant dissenters keep it in mind—when we shall have an opportunity of letting honourable members know what we think of the manner in which their stewardship has been discharged. Let the constituencies of London, of Edinburgh, of Lambeth, of Marylebone, of the Tower Hamlets, of Leicester, we are grieved at heart to add, of Stockport, and a hundred other places, prepare for the discharge of their duty. For ourselves, the resolution is taken—and we know that we are not alone,—no matter what the claims preferred, what the services rendered, the man who has voted for this iniquitous measure, be he who he may, whig, radical, complete suffragist, free-trader, or pseudo-voluntary, shall never have our support. We have been disposed to bear with much—perhaps too much—for the sake of a common cause. Our representatives have never been required to pledge themselves to measures antagonistic to the existing hierarchy, but this recklessness of principle, this contemptuous disregard of our conscientious scruples, is not to be borne. To have been passive in the former case may have been questionable, but to continue our suffrage to men who,—where no vested interests existed, where the plea of antiquity had not place, where the sentiments of the people were outraged,—have originated a new ecclesiastical institute, as if in sport of conscience, would be to evidence an indifference to principle equal to their own, and an utter unworthiness of the position in which the providence of God has placed us. The present parliament is approaching to its close, but the liberal members calculate on the public feeling subsiding before they have occasion again to meet their constituents. It rests with us to shew, that they misapprehend us,—that as we are influenced by principle, not by passion, our resolution will partake of the enduring character of religious convictions. Let dissenters then immediately assemble in all parts of the kingdom. Let them take counsel with

each other, and enter into a solemn confederation, that on no account whatever, unless public repentance be evinced, will they exercise their suffrage for any man who has desecrated religion and scoffed at conscience by recording his vote in support of the ministerial Bill. We are glad to find that the *British Anti-State Society*, at a public meeting in Tottenham-court Chapel, London, April 21st, has called attention to this point. The resolution then adopted, which we transfer to our pages for the guidance of our readers, was as follows:

‘That the proposal of a measure so palpably infringing the first principles of religious freedom, the amount of support it has received in the House of Commons, and the arguments by which it has been defended, convince this meeting that the cause of freedom has but feeble support in the house supposed to represent the people; and justify it in calling on the electoral body throughout the United Kingdom, to exercise the elective franchise on all future occasions, with a special reference to the preservation and extension of the principles of religious liberty at home and in the colonies.’

On the character of the opposition offered to the ministerial measure we must say a few words. It is sufficiently evident from what has been said, that we have no sympathy with the views expressed, or the grounds of opposition put forth, by members of the English establishment. As between their church and the papacy we do not interfere, believing that both are unsound in constitution, seriously detrimental to religion, and alike obstructive to political freedom. As such, therefore, we have no interest in their contention, and had not the question a larger scope than their interests, our voice would be silent. If we admitted the necessity for a church establishment in Ireland, we should be compelled to vote on behalf of that of Rome. Its adherents constitute the overwhelming majority of the Irish people; while the protestant hierarchy is regarded with mistrust and abhorrence. But we deny any such necessity, affirming, that all establishments, whether protestant or catholic, episcopal, presbyterian, or congregational, are only adapted to secularize religion, and to estrange from her confidence the great body of the people.

Neither can we look with favour—truth compels the statement—on the *Central Anti-Maynooth Committee*. We admit the zeal with which it has laboured, but we cannot approve its constitution or regard its procedure with complacency. The views taken of this question by churchmen and dissenters, are so essentially diverse, that though their *immediate* object may be the same, they cannot proceed two steps together without a sacrifice of principle on the one side or the other. Their resolutions and public acts must be of a complexion which savours of the one

party or the other. They must speak the language of the 'No Popery' faction, or denounce the principle of state grants for religious purposes ; they must recognise the title of the legislature to decide on the truth or falsehood of religious creeds, or must wholly repudiate its interference with the conscience and worship of the people. Into whatever compact individuals may enter, the public will judge of such organizations by their adopted resolutions. Let this rule then be applied to the resolutions of Exeter Hall and Covent Garden, and to the addresses and circulars which have been issued from the London Coffee House, and we defy any candid man to say, that an uniformed bystander could draw any other conclusion than that, the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee was an embodiment of the same evil spirit which has so frequently disgraced and cursed our country. We perceive, indeed, that at the meeting held on the 22nd of April, an attempt was made to guard against the danger to which we advert ; but the circumstances which marked the effort were suspicious, and the ground of opposition recognised was insufficient, and, so far as the dissenting members of the committee are concerned, wanting, to say the least, in candour. It is within our knowledge, that the documents issued by this committee have seriously damaged our cause. They have been taken by many senators—and we do not wonder at it—as evidence of our sharing in the intolerance and bigotry of the clergy. Knowing little of dissenters, they not unnaturally infer from the furious rancour of speakers, with whom some of our men are publicly associated, that we are renegades from the cause of liberty, and strangely indifferent to the rights of the Irish people. We confess, therefore, that we greatly prefer a separate course of action, in which each section of opponents to the ministerial Bill may speak the language of an honest and intelligible consistency. Dr. Payne's admirable letter to Sir Culling Eardley Smith, has set the duty of dissenters in its true light. It is at once clear and compact, temperate and decided, just such an exposition of the case, as the interests of truth required. The following concluding passage sums up and applies his argument :

' Now, you, Sir Culling, call upon Sir Robert Peel to act as a minister—to decide what is true and false in religion as a minister—and to give support (for I imagine that your principle implies this), or withhold support, as a minister. By requiring us not to petition against the grant, on dissenting principles, you take from us the only consistent ground on which, as dissenters, we can petition—the only ground on which, even churchmen are now beginning to see, any consistent petition can rest. So strongly do I feel the inconsistency and the danger of the course you recommend, that, if I did not know

you to be a friend—an able, warm-hearted friend—I should mistake you for an enemy. Greatly do I marvel to find, in your letter, a reference to the constitution of our country, and to hear you saying that it pronounces a certain system of faith to be false and dangerous! What, if it does? Is that, to a dissenter, a sufficient reason even for *personal* action against it? And yet you seem to plead it as a reason for *government* action!

The course advocated by Dr. Payne is happily that which, in the main, has been pursued by protestant dissenters. There may have been exceptions, but they are only few, and where they have occurred, it has been from want of consideration rather than any intentional deviation from the course generally adopted. The character of dissenting opposition will be best learnt from the resolutions in which our various bodies have publicly recorded their sentiments. Some few of these we shall adduce in illustration of the case, and as matters of historical importance.

The *British Anti-State Church Society* is unquestionably one of the most potent organizations amongst us. Its *Council* of 500, comprises many of the most distinguished members of the several dissenting bodies of the empire, whilst the simplicity of its constitution, and the directness of its labours, are steadily working it into the confidence of the most enlightened and zealous portion of the community. The views recorded by this society are therefore an important element for consideration in the estimate of dissenting feeling, and these will sufficiently appear by the second and fourth of the resolutions adopted on the 26th of March. These resolutions are as follows:—

‘That this committee cordially admit the claim of their Roman catholic fellow-countrymen, irrespectively of their religious views, to the enjoyment of every right to which the citizens of a free community are entitled; and they protest, with equal earnestness, against the outrage done to the feelings of the Roman catholic population of Ireland by the establishment of the protestant episcopal church, as they do against the wrong sought to be inflicted upon protestants by giving state support to the diffusion of Romanism.

‘That, therefore, this committee, while they record their decided objection to the appropriation of any portion of the national funds, whether in the shape of parliamentary grants, or otherwise, to nonconforming communities, or to the support of the existing protestant establishments, and are engaged in seeking, by all constitutional means, the dissolution of the alliance between the church and the state, in all its forms, emphatically protest against the endowment of the Roman catholic ecclesiastical institutions, as an uncalled-for and impolitic extension of a principle which they repudiate as inimical to the civil and religious interests of the empire.’

The second resolution of the *Committee of the Congregational Union*, the most powerful organization existing in the Congregational body, expresses the same sentiment, and faithfully represents the views of that denomination. This resolution is as follows:—

‘That this committee looks back, with indignation, upon the wrongs under which the Roman catholic population of Ireland so long groaned, and rejoicing that many of them have been redressed, would have every remnant of them removed by equitable and enlightened legislation;—but this committee protests, with equal and decisive earnestness, against every employment of the resources or power of the state, either to sustain, or to suppress, the Roman catholic religion, or any other religion whatever; and feels entirely consistent in opposing with double energy, grants of public money, in aid of what it deems deadly error, while it steadfastly resists the granting of state-assistance for what it regards as the highest truth.’

The Committee of the *Baptist Union*, standing in the same relation to the Baptist denomination, as the former committee does to the Congregational, is equally explicit in the statement of its views, which are specially set forth in the following resolutions, being the second and fourth of those adopted on the 26th of March.

‘That this Committee, objecting, on principle, to the application of the resources of the state to ecclesiastical purposes of every kind, and having, consequently, disapproved the annual grant to the seminary at Maynooth heretofore made, regard with determined hostility the proposition now announced by the first minister of the crown, to increase the grant, to triple its customary amount, and to secure it in perpetuity by an act of Parliament.

‘That, in offering this resistance to the further endowment of the Roman catholic church in Ireland, this committee are not actuated by any wish to deprive their fellow-subjects of that persuasion of any equitable privilege, civil or religious; that, in point of religion, this committee, in contending for the dependence of Roman catholic teachers upon voluntary support, are desirous of placing them in the position which, in their judgment, ought to be occupied by every religious community, and which is, without complaint, occupied by themselves; and that, in point of general education, this Committee claim for the Roman catholics, as for all classes, a free and equal admission to the literary institutions of the country.’

Two other organizations exist amongst us which may fairly be taken to represent the opinions and feelings of no inconsiderable number. There are the *General Body of protestant dissenting ministers of the three Denominations*, in and about London, and the *Deputies* constituting a lay representation of the congregations in the same locality. Both these bodies have recorded

their sentiments, and it is of importance to note in what terms they have done so. The first two resolutions of the former are as follows :—

‘That this body has heard with the deepest anxiety and alarm of the proposal of Her Majesty’s government greatly to augment the parliamentary grant to the Roman catholic college of Maynooth, in Ireland, and of the intended introduction to the legislature of a Bill to remove that grant from the annual votes of the House of Commons, and so to make the endowment permanent; which, if allowed to become law, will, in the opinion of this body, virtually establish popery in that country by act of Parliament.

‘That in the judgment of this body, it is in principle unjust, and in its tendency most mischievous, to appropriate the resources of the state to the endowment of any religious institution whatsoever; and that it is neither unjust nor uncharitable toward the Roman catholics of Ireland, to demand that the education of their priesthood be left to the same voluntary support, by which the seminaries and colleges of the nonconformist ministers of England and Wales have been founded, and are sustained.’

The latter body, that of the *Deputies*, has recorded its sentiments with equal explicitness in the following, amongst other resolutions, wherein, whilst avowing its opposition to the government measure, it carefully guards against the misconstruction to which its procedure might otherwise be liable.

‘That this deputation, entertaining the conviction that state Endowments for religious purposes are equally at variance with the legitimate ends of government, and the true interests of religion, view with settled aversion the Bill now before Parliament for the permanent endowment of the Roman catholic college of Maynooth, and for placing the college and buildings under the supervision of the Commissioners of public works in Ireland.

‘That in opposing the proposed perpetuation and extension of the grant to Maynooth college, this deputation are but carrying out the principle on which they have heretofore opposed, and do now again firmly protest against, the annual grant made by Parliament to the presbyterians in Ireland, and poor protestant dissenting ministers in England; and they distinctly deny the assertion that has been publicly made, to the effect that the protestant dissenters have never, until now, opposed the grant to Maynooth college, nor any of those numerous measures in Ireland and in the colonies, involving payments to Roman catholic priests for services performed as chaplains to prisons and workhouses, or otherwise—the fact being that this deputation have embraced every suitable opportunity of expressing their entire disapprobation of the principle of such payments.’

It is due, in candour, that we admit—and we do it unhesitatingly—that two of the bodies from whose resolutions we quote, have recorded other reasons than those adduced, in sup-

port of their views. We refer to the Committee of the Congregational Union, and to the Ministers of the Three Denominations. These resolutions, however, were adopted as supplemental only, and not as superseding the others—as expressive of the views entertained of popery, and not as constituting the main ground of opposition. They are expressly stated by the latter body to be ‘special reasons’ *additional* ‘to the general principle on which its opposition to the endowment of religious institutions by the state’ is based, and cannot be read in connexion with their associates without being so understood. Nevertheless, we regret their adoption as ill-timed and injurious, tending to obscure the truth, to impair the force of the testimony borne, to alienate friends, and to excite and irritate opponents. The terms employed in the third resolution of the Committee of the Congregational Union cannot fail, in the case of men uninformed respecting our sentiments, to make an impression vastly different from that which was designed. They mislead rather than inform, and thus subserve the purpose of error, instead of advancing the interests of truth. It is within our knowledge that this resolution was handed about amongst the liberal members of the House, as proof of the bitterness and rancour by which dissenters are actuated.

The resolutions we have quoted are in strict accordance with the sentiments expressed by dissenters in all parts of the country. This might be established by overwhelming evidence, but we have adduced enough to satisfy every candid man. What, then, must we think, what must every impartial and reflecting man think of the gross slanders and passionate vituperations of Mr. Sheil, who, in defiance of all evidence, in utter scorn of facts which glared upon him, could speak of the Church of England as ‘looking down from her serene elevation with cold neutrality on this great sectarian affray,’ and on the dissenters of Great Britain, ‘the three denominations,’ as he designated them, as the bitterest and the most rancorous enemies to Ireland? We leave the member for Dungarvon to the satisfaction which his calmer moments must yield, assured that such slanders are injurious only to the man who utters them. One or two reflections force themselves upon us before we close.

How comes it to pass, we naturally inquire, that such a measure should, in the year 1845, have been submitted to the British legislature, and have obtained the support of so large a majority of the Commons’ House? The full discussion of this question requires much more space than we have now at our command. We can merely indicate what we deem the true solution, and must wait some future opportunity to examine the matter at large. The discussions and votes of the House,—for

Mr. Ward's amendment has been negatived by a majority of 322 to 148,—evidence the dawning of truth mingled with much error,—the perception, in part, of the viciousness of past legislature, with an utter ignorance of the true and only remedy. Our senators are beginning to feel, and have now recorded their conviction, that the ascendancy of the protestant church in Ireland is an insult and a wrong. The experience of centuries has at length forced from them this acknowledgment. So far it is well. Church-of-Englandism, as a specific form of the establishment principle, is on the wane; and its political patrons are, in consequence, compelled to resort to measures which they would formerly have rejected with scorn. But how is it, that a sense of past misgovernment is associated with so much misapprehension of the true principles of legislation? How is it, that the men who acknowledge it to have been wrong to make the catholics of Ireland contribute to the support of the protestant hierarchy, do not see that it is equally vicious to make the protestants of the empire contribute to the support of the papacy? How is it that principles with which we have long been familiar, which are as household words among us, are so little known, so slightly estimated by our rulers? We fear, that in replying to these questions we must criminate ourselves. Had we been faithful to the truth as we should have been; had our zeal in its advocacy been proportioned to that which we exhibit in other directions; had we laboured on its behalf with an energy and self-devotion comporting with its higher claims, our senators could not have displayed the ignorance they have recently evinced. They might still have disliked the truth, they might have attempted in various ways to evade its obligations, they might have decried it as intolerant, have sneered at it as methodistical, but we should not have seen the disgraceful misapprehension of first principles, which the parliamentary debate has displayed. The absence of a large and comprehensive sense of duty has given a character of indifference and feebleness to the movements of dissent which has prolonged the reign of ignorance, and encouraged our rulers to attempt further oppressions upon conscience. We fear there is too much truth in the opinion expressed in one of the resolutions adopted at a public meeting of the *Anti-State Society*, convened in the London Tabernacle, on the 14th of April, which affirmed—

‘That the supineness and indifference of dissenters respecting the progress of their principles, and with regard to the injustice of state churches, have unintentionally encouraged the government to take the initiative in the increase of the Maynooth Grant for establishing by law the Roman catholic church in Ireland.’

In this state of things, our first duty after a clear and practi-

cal exhibition of our sentiments, is to look about us for suitable men to represent us in parliament. This is the great difficulty, and our best energies must be directed to master it. We must not sit quietly down under the conviction, that such men are not to be found. They are in existence, and must be brought forth, men of clear understandings, of settled convictions, of determined purpose, who unite religious devotedness to the emancipation of the church, to a deep and cordial sympathy with the righteous demands of the popular mind. We know of no nobler or higher vocation, none more worthy of engrossing the energies, or of having consecrated to it the whole life of any man. He who with competent abilities should enter on such a field of labour, in a spirit of enlightened and ardent devotion, and give himself to its duties with singleness of purpose and untiring zeal, would become a benefactor to his species of no ordinary kind. His motives might probably at first be misapprehended, his early efforts be unsustained. Unreflecting piety might condemn, worldly politicians despise, and sectional interests and prejudices cross his path; but, so surely as he held steadily on in his career, would he gather round him the elements of a moral power before which intolerance and latitudinarianism, political corruption and priestly craft, would ultimately be compelled to tremble.

Brief Notices.

The Comedies, Histories, Tragedies, and Poems of William Shakspeare.
 Edited by Charles Knight. (Library Edition.) Vol. XII. 8vo.
 London: 1844.

WHEN this work was about half through the press, we testified our approbation of its plan and execution; of the pains and judgment which the editor had employed on the text; of the valuable introduction and *excursus*, historical, and critical, with which each drama is accompanied; of the immense mass of valuable antiquarian and philosophical information embodied in the notes; and of that profuse and pleasant commentary of pictorial illustrations, which give to this edition so unique an interest. Of the praise then bestowed, we do not feel disposed to retract a single syllable. We then declared our opinion, that Mr. Knight's promised to be incomparably the most complete edition of Shakspeare hitherto given to the world, and now that the work is finished, we are of opinion that it is so.

The volume just published, the twelfth and last, contains the poems

of Shakspeare, and extensive criticisms on the spurious and doubtful works ascribed to him. The 'Yorkshire Tragedy,' Mr. Knight supposes, on very general grounds of criticism, not to be Shakspeare's. If it be not the work of the great poet, it at least contains many touches and expressions—nay, long passages which are scarcely unworthy of him, and which few but himself could have produced. We acquiesce, however, in Mr. Knight's opinion, as to its not being the work of Shakspeare, though we can hardly divest ourselves of the feeling, that he might have here and there vivified it by his genius. Similar remarks apply to 'Arden of Faversham,' as to which Mr. Knight is more doubtful, whether it be not a genuine work of Shakspeare's.

Of the judgment, truth, and taste of the great majority of Mr. Knight's criticisms, on these disputed works, we cannot speak too highly. He has carried into their investigation the same enlarged views, searching spirit, and minute examination of details which pervade the whole edition. As the volume can be procured separately, we should imagine it will prove a welcomed boon to very many, who, possessing other and costly editions of Shakspeare, may not be disposed to purchase the whole of the 'Library Edition;' and we would suggest to Mr. Knight, whether it be not worth while to publish it in a separate form. We thought, but it seems erroneously, that Mr. Knight's biography of Shakspeare was to have formed part of the present edition.

Peril in Security: A Memorial of N. E. Parker, late House Surgeon to the Macclesfield Dispensary. By S. W. Rix. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co. 1844.

A PLEASING and affecting tribute to the memory of a young man, who, with every prospect of eminent success in his professional labours, fell a victim to consumption. The title of the book is derived from the fact, that in the practice of things lovely, honest, and of good report, he was indifferent to the peculiar truths of the gospel; enjoying a false and delusive peace, instead of that of reconciliation. The discipline of providence, and the faithful admonitions of friends, appear to have aroused him from apathy, and led him to understand and value religious truth. The book may with advantage be placed in the hands of medical students.

Elements of Arithmetic and Algebra: for the use of the Royal Military College. By William Scott, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Mathematics in the Institution. London: Longman and Co. 8vo. 1844. pp. 500.

THIS is one of the Sandhurst Text Books of Mathematics—the first of the series in point of order—but not the first published. About two years ago we noticed the 'Geometry' of the same series, and have much pleasure in bestowing equal commendation on the work before us. Nearly half the ample volume is given to arithmetic, and

rather more than half to algebra; and as the page is full, though the type and mode of printing are remarkably clear, each subject is treated with a degree of fullness, which is not to be found in the generality of elementary treatises. Great pains have been evidently taken to unite perspicuity with brevity. Principles are explained with much precision and clearness, and what is often needed in works of this kind, an ample number of examples is appended to the rules and formalities, to which the solutions are in every case given. The fullest consideration is bestowed on practical, as well as scientific arithmetic; and in algebra, over and above a fuller treatment of all the ordinary subjects than is to be found in more elementary treatises, not less than fifty pages are given to 'the Composition and Resolution of Equations—Elimination and its Application—the Resolution of Numerical Equations—Sturm's Theorem—Horner's Method for the Resolution of Numerical Equations—and the Solution of Literal Equations of the third and fourth degrees.' Upon the whole, we consider it a work which may not only be very useful in a college, but one of the very best with which a private student of the mathematics can provide himself. We shall be happy to see the remaining volumes of the series, and if as judiciously executed as the first two, we have little doubt that they will ultimately attain, as they will assuredly deserve, an extensive circulation.'

Laodicea; or religious declension. Its nature, indications, causes, consequences, and remedies. An Essay, by David Everhard Ford, author of 'Decapolis,' &c. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. 1844. pp. 118.

A LITTLE work, well adapted for usefulness; and which, as Mr Ford is so well known to the religious public, needs no recommendation to those who have favourably received his other publications.

The Supplement to the Penny Cyclopædia of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. Part I: Abatement—Amberger. London: C. Knight.

The *Penny Cyclopædia* is one of the ablest and most useful of modern publications; and the *Supplement*, the first Part of which now lies before us, promises to enhance its value very considerably. The progress of human knowledge is perpetually out-stripping the industry of authorship, and the most complete and elaborate works are in consequence soon doomed to the charge of deficiency. Geography enlarges her boundaries, science opens new fields for human inspection or greatly extends those previously known, biography has to recount the deeds of men recently deceased, while history receives new light from the disclosures of long-concealed records or from the achievements of statesmen or warriors. Hence the importance of our Cyclopædias being perpetually brought up to the information of the day, and the wisdom of

the course pursued by the projectors of the one before us. To the purchasers of the *Penny Cyclopædia*, this *Supplement* will be indispensable; and to all other readers or consulters of books it will be an invaluable digest of the most recent and important additions to the stock of human knowledge. Like its predecessor, it is the joint production of many minds, highly distinguished in their several departments, and is under the editorship of a gentleman whose competence is admitted by all.

The Complete Works of the Rev. Andrew Fuller. With a Memoir of his Life. By A. G. Fuller. Parts I. II. and III. London: G. and J. Dyer.

It would be superfluous to commend the writings of Andrew Fuller. They have taken their station amongst the most valuable theological productions of the past generation, and will survive so long as masculine force, transparent and conclusive reasoning, and the clearest exhibition of scriptural truth which modern times have witnessed, retain their hold on the English mind. The present edition, in imperial octavo, is to consist of twelve parts at two shillings each. It is printed on good paper and in a clear type, and is enriched by the Memoir of the author from the pen of his son.

Literary Intelligence.

Shortly will be Published,

Views of the Voluntary Principle. In Four Series. By Edward Miall. •

Just Published.

A Commentary on the Apocalypse. By Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass. 2 vols.

A Grammar of the Latin Language. By C. G. Zumpt, Ph. D. Translated from the Ninth Edition of the Original, and Adapted to the Use of English Students. By Leonhard Schmitz, Ph. D. With Numerous Additions and Corrections by the Author.

Scriptural Conversations between Charles and his Mother. By Lady Charles Fitzroy.

A Memoir of the Hon. and Most Rev. Power Le Poer Trench, last Archbishop of Tuam. By the Rev. Joseph d'Arcy Sirr, D.D.

Seasons of Sorrow. Original Poems. By John Pring.

A Summary view of the Evidences of Christianity, In a Letter from the Right Honourable Charles Kendal Bushe. With a Preface and Notes. By the Rev. James Wills, A.M.

Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. Edited by William Smith, L.L.D. P. XI.

Plan of an Improved Income Tax and Real Free Trade, with an Equitable Mode of Redeeming the National Debt, and some Observations on

the Education and Employment of the People—on Systematic Colonization—and on the Welfare of the Labouring Classes. By James S. Buckingham.

Another Letter to the Viscount Sandon, M.P., containing a Protest against some Propositions laid down by the Rev. Hugh M'Neile, Respecting the intended Grant to Maynooth. By Rowland Williams, M.A.

Fasting Not a Christian Duty. An Essay occasioned by the Increased Importance attached to its Observance. By John Collyer Knight, of the British Museum.

A Lecture on the Arguments for Christian Theism, from Organized Life and Fossil Osteology, Containing Remarks on a Work entitled 'Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation.' By John Sheppard.

The Position, Prospects, and Duties of that Body of Christians usually denominated Independents or Congregationalists, briefly considered, the Substance of a Paper read before an Assembly of Ministers at Brighton, April 16th, 1844. By William Davis, Minister of the Croft Chapel, Hastings.

Church Patronage, more particularly as developed in the so-called National Establishment of England and Wales, as also in Ireland. By Matthew Bridges, Esq.

American Facts, Notes, and Statistics relative to the Government Resources, Engagements, Manufactures, Commerce, Religion, Education, Literature, Fine Arts, Manners and Customs, of the United States of America. By George Palmer Putnam. With Portrait and a Map.

On the Origin and Ramifications of the English Language. Preceded by an Enquiry into the Primitive Seats, Early Migrations, and Final Settlements of the Principal European Nations. By Henry Welsford, Esq.

The Power of the Soul over the Body, considered in relation to Health and Morals. By George Moore, M.D.

History of the Reformation in Switzerland. By Abraham Ruchat, Minister of the Gospel, and Professor of Belles Lettres in the Academy of Lausanne. The first four vols. to the year 1537. Edition of M. L. Vulliemin. In seven vols., at Nyon, Switzerland, A.D. 1838. Abridged from the French. By the Rev. J. Collinson, M.A.

Education the Birthright of every Human Being, and the only Scriptural Preparation for the Millenium; exhibiting the present imperfect State of Popular Instruction, and the Means of rendering it Effectual for the Salvation of the Country and the World. By the Rev. B. Parsons.

Life of Jean Paul F. Richter. Compiled from various Sources; together with his Auto-biography. Translated from the German. 2 vols.

The Life of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White. Written by Himself. With Portions of his Correspondence. Edited by John Hamilton Thom. 3 vols.

The Angels of God; their Nature, Character, Ranks, and Ministerial Services, as Exhibited in the Holy Scriptures. By the Rev. Thomas Timpson.

Our Era. A Soliloquy in Three Parts—Social—Political—Religious. With Miscellaneous Pieces. By W. Leask.

The Rejected Cases. With a Letter to Thomas Wakley, M.P., On the Scientific Character of Homœopathy. By John Epps, M.D.